Their shameleſſe Legendaries report indeed, that we haue put men into Beares skinnes, and ſet dogges to worry them. But they that wrote ſuch things, had neither truth, nor modeſty in ſo writing.

They complaine much alſo of ſome Ieſuits, Seminaries, and other *Romane* Catholiques, adiudged vnto death in this Land. And it is true, that ſome ſuch haue beene executed, but not any, ſimply for any matter of Religion and diuine Seruice, but either for Fellonies, and Treaſons, and that ſome ſuch as the like were neuer heard of in any age; or for ſuch erronious, and hereticall poynts of Doctrine as directly impugneth the Soueraignty of the State, and inforced a neceſſity of ſuch Lawes, and execution of them vpon ſome notorious Offendors, and ſeditious practiſers to ſeduce the ſubiects from their allegeance. But this is cleared in many other places, and heere it may ſuffice to ſhew, that which hath beene proued, That the Martyrs of the Primitiue Church dyed for that truth which is now profeſſed in *England*. Which hauing beene thus proued by this Treatiſe, there hath beene performed whatſoeuer is deſired. Which God grant may be of as good vſe to ſuch as haue deſired it: as the writer from his ſoule doth pray God may vouchſafe them.

FINIS.

4

A PREAMBLE VNTO AN INCOVNTER WITH *P. R.* THE AVTHOR of the deceitfull Treatise of *Mitigation*:

Concerning the Romish doctrine both in question of *Rebellion* and of *Aequinocation*:

By

THOMAS MORTON.

Am I your enemy because I tell you the truth?
GALAT. 4. 16.

Published by Authoritie.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

LONDON,
Printed by *Melch. Bradwood* for *Iohn Bill* and *Edmond Weauer*.
1608.

University Library Cambridge.

A

PREAMBLE

UNTO

A NUNCOVNTER

WITH P. R. THE AUTHOR

of the deceitfull Treatise of

Mitigation

Concerning the Romish doctrine both in question of

Rebellion and of Equivocation.

By

THOMAS MORTON.

GALAT. 4. 16.

Published by Authoritie.

71:04

LONDON,

Printed by Melch. Bradwood for John Bill,

and Edward Weaver.

1608.

TO THE RIGHT HONOVRABLE,

and his ſingular good

Lord,

ROBERT *Earle of* SALISBVRY,

Principall Secretarie to his Maieſtie, &c.

and the moſt Woorthy Chancellar of the

Vniuerſity of CAMBRIDGE,

Grace and peace.

THere are not many weeks paſt (Right Honourable) ſince a perſon, diſguiſed by theſe dumbe characters of P. R. had couertly ſent forth a Booke, inſcribed, A Treatiſe of Mitigation, which he aduentured to addreſſe vnto both the Vniuerſities, eſpecially that, wherein, by the bleſſing of God, I haue had my education, and whereof this is the happineſſe, that it hath your Lordſhip Chancellar and Protector. I therefore eſteemed it my dutie in preſence

of your Honor, by this Preamble, to ſponge out ſuch vile imputations, wherewith he indeuoured through me (alas) one of the leaſt of the Prophets to diſtaine both my Mother and her Sister the famous Vniuerſities; and thoſe honorable perſons vnto whoſe care and prouidence they are committed. At the firſt reading thereof, although (I confeſſe) I receiued ſome ſuch impreſſions as that I was not able to imagine that any, profeſſing Diuinity, could be ſo vtterly deſtitute of humanity, as when he clamorouſly inueigheth againſt (as he pretendeth) multiplicitie of falſifications, he himſelfe ſhould moſt vſually and egregiouſly falſifie: yet then, euen in my greateſt iealouſie of mine owne miſcariage, I conceiued a double matter of comfort: firſt, from my ſelfe, that knowing I durſt preſent my ſupplications vnto the Iudge of the ſecret thoughts of all hearts, and iuſt Reuenger of all lying wickedneſſe; I did not doubt but that being able with true confidence to appeare before God, I ſhould not greatly feare the cenſure of man. Secondly, from my Auerſarie, preſuming that he that would write in defenſe of their Mentall Æquiuocation, would be found to equiuocate in writing. But much more was this my diuination fortified at the view of his Treatiſe; for euen as the Greeke Commander, who being in apparance mortally wounded, demanded of his Souldiers, Numquid tuta eſt Ciuitas? numquid clypeus meus integer? Is the Citie ſafe? is my ſhield ſound? And being ſatiſ-

fied in both recouered his health, and afterwards became victorious: So I likewise, vnder so many ghastly wounds of a virulent pen, hauing generally inquired and vprightly answered my selfe, that my cause was safe, and my conscience sound, and free from any notorious and wilfull falsitie; I then began more resolutely to confront my Aduersarie in this Prelude and First assault: and promise (if God shall be pleased) a more forcible Incounter, after that I haue discharged my part in another taske of more importance, namely, in The Answer vnto the misconceiued Catholike Apologie: which by this calumnious Treatise of P. R. his Mitigation, as by an aduerse tempest, hath receiued some interruption. This Preamble (Right Honourable) as a Suruey of some particulars, which being vnfolded, may, if not satisfie the expectation, yet at the least stay the preiudice and precipitation of some, I do humbly present vnto your Lordship, as vnto a most zealous Patron of the Truth, a vigilant Discouerer of malignant practises, a prouident Director of one of those Vniuersities, whereunto my Aduersarie presumeth to appeale; submitting my selfe vnto the equanimitie of your honourable iudgement; to which, if by this Briefe it be not manifest, that P. R. hath in this Treatise preuaricated in his whole cause both in the question of Rebellion and of Æquiuocation, betraied his Countreys State, disgraced the Romish Schooles, strangled his owne conscience, I refuse not, that

to the crimes obiected against me by him, this may be added, That I durst affirme thus much before your Lordship. For whose continuance of health, increase of honour, accomplishment of all Spirituall Graces I shall not cease to pray. Our Lord Iesus *preserue vs to the glorie of his sauing Grace.*

Your Honours

in all Christian dutie

THOMAS MORTON.

A PREAMBVLATORY EPISTLE vnto P.R. the *Mitigator*.

THere be but two Romiſh Maladies (Maſter P.R.) which in my books of *Diſcouery* and *Full Satisfaction* might ſtand need of your *Mitigation*: the one is the vſurped and tranſcendent Iuriſdiction of the Pope aduanced aboue all Chriſtian Kingdomes, to the troubling or ſubuerting of all Princes and people of contrary Religion; the other is your profeſſed Art of *mentall Equiuocation*. The firſt of theſe I haue proued to be (in the Proteſtant States) the Damme, and the ſecond the Baud to rebellion: therefore haue I been by you cenſured for *a falſe and ſlandrous Libeller*. But if, as the woman in pleading of her cauſe appealed from the Iudge ſleeping vnto the ſame Iudge better informed, you will giue me leaue to appeale from *P.R.* as he is a *Paſſionate Railer*, vnto *P.R.* as he is a *Placable Reaſoner*; then I am ſure no man ſhall proue either me *a falſe ſlanderer*, or you a true *Mitigator*: becauſe you in your *Treatiſe* haue eſta-

blished such a Papall authority, which (after denunciation of sentence) may depriue Protestant Kings (in your opinion Heretikes) of their Kingdomes; making all such Protestant Princes and all their adherents also alliable vnto all those penalties, which the Popish Canons, by you defended, haue awarded against Heretikes, which are, losse of lands, of honours, and of their liues; so farre, as to allow that euery man may in such a case sheath his sword in his brothers throat: not disproouing your fellowes, who conclude that all this must be done, when there is sufficient meanes of performance. And shall not Protestants (except they will acknowledge themselues to haue deserued a new Massacre) call this your doctrine execrable and *rebellious*? We reade of *Petilian* a Donatist, who to the end he might moderate and mitigate the sharpe reproach of the crueltie of his sect intended against the Orthodoxall Professors, did make a great boast of courtesie and humanitie: against whom *S. Augustine* writeth thus:

Aug. lib. 2. adu. Petil. cap. 83. *Isto modo & miluus, cùm columbos rapere non potuerit, columbum se nominat; vbi enim potuistis, & non fecistis?* That is, *By this meanes* (saith S. Augustine) *a Kite, when he can not seize vpon a Doue, will be a Doue: for, I pray you, when did you spare vs, being able to hurt vs?* The like boast of other Heretikes, called *Rogationists*, receiued the like Answer: to wit: *Nulla bestia, si neminem vulneret, propterea mansueta dicitur, si dentes & vngues non habet: sæuire vos nolle dicitis, ego non posse arbitror; si autem possetis, quanta faceretis, quandò nihil potestis, & non cessatis?* That is, *There is no beast, which may be called tame, because it doth no hurt when it hath neither teeth nor talant: You* (Rogationists) *say you will*

August. Ep. 48. ad Vincent.

not miſchieue vs; but I rather thinke you can not: for how will not you do what poſsibly you can, ſeeing you ceaſe not to be doing, when you can do nothing at all? Are not theſe *Rogationiſts* and you Romaniſts equally bent to like miſchiefe? Is not your Defence *(P. R.) Miluus & Columbus, A Kitiſh Doue?* For by the Title pretending *Mitigation* and *Obedience*, it may ſeem to be a *Doue*, but by the *Treatiſe* it ſelfe profeſſing a plaine rebellion, it proueth a *Kite*. Whereby we may ſuſpect that in the capitall characters of your name *P.* may betoken a *Petilian*, and *R.* a *Rogationiſt*. Otherwiſe, anſwer your Aduerſaries ſincerely vnto this their Interrogatorie; *Did you euer ſpare vs, being ſufficiently able to hurt vs?* For the time paſt you can not ſatisfie; for the time to come you will not ingage your ſelfe further than your Preface hath promiſed, viz. *It is not impoſsible for vs to liue in ſubiection.* But will you know the beſt way to prooue your Aduerſarie *T. M.* ſlanderous? Then muſt you teach your Diſciples to ceaſe to be murderous. Your ſecond, and (as you call it) *the ſpeciall part*, which is the Defence of *Mentall Equiuocation*, is no whit better fortified: for the maine reaſon to free it from a lie, is, becauſe the outward ſpeech, [as *I am no Prieſt*] is mixed with a *clauſe reſerued in the minde*, [as, *To tell it vnto you.*] Wherein againe I appeale from your Poſition to your Confeſſion, granting, That *there is a mentall Equiuocation, which no clauſe of reſeruation can ſaue from a lie.* Which one Confeſſion is ſufficient to conuince all your Mentall Equiuocators to be apparently liers. Hauing thus obteined my cauſe in both queſtions, although you rage and raue, diſgorging your ſtomacke, and caſting vpon me all the cankred and galfull termes

it could vnder: yet can I not be offended with you, except only (as *Tully* spoke in the like case) *Quia me nocere voluisti: Because you meant to doe me iniurie.* After you had laboured, by disabling my iudgement concerning the cause, to wound me in the head, you proceed further, to preiudice my conscience, by pretending *multiplicitie of frauds and falsifications*, seeking thereby (for so I may call it) to stab me at the heart. But know (*P. R.*) that your false and calumnious obiections of *falsifications* are in this *Preamble* so farre discouered, that I may truly thinke the Scripture verified vpon you, where it is thus written: *Therefore art thou inexcusable, ô man, whosoeuer thou be, that iudgest; for doing the same things, by iudging another thou condemnest thy selfe.* Therfore I wish you in the feare of God, so to vse your iudgement in this life, as still remembring, that after death you must be called to iudgement.

Rom. 2. 1.

Our Lord *Iesus* preserue vs to the glorie of his sauing Grace.

Farewell.

Yours to warne, and to be warned,

THO. MORTON.

A table of the particular contents, and Paragraphes of the insuing Preamble.

FIrst part is concerning the sufficiency of P. R. *to vndertake any challenge.* §. 1. pag. 1

An argument that P. R. *his wit was in a slumber in answering to the point of the sleeping souldiers.* §. 2. pag. 2

An argument of his memory bewraying his free will to lying in the point of the clause of Reseruation. §. 3. pag. 5

P. R. *his skill in Logicke, prouoking all Vniuersities to laugh at him, both in the point of Syllogizing,* §. 4. pag. 7. *And also in diuiding* pag. 12

P. R. *obiecting Greeke and Hebrew texts, and thereby gaining to himselfe the opinion of rare ignorance.* §. 5. pag. 12

P. R. *glorying in a triumphant falshood in his obiection of falsitie concerning the testimonie of* Caterius. §. 6. pag. 15

P. R. *his presumptuous falshood in charging* T. M. *with falsitie in allegation of the testimonie of* Dolman. §. 7. pag. 18

P. R. *his foure malitious tricks of falshood in obiecting a falsitie concerning the testimony of* Frisingensis. §. 8. pag. 25

The second part, proouing that P. R. *is no sufficient Aduocate for our English case, deciphering the disposition of both my Aduersaries, viz. the* Moderate Answerer *and this* Mitigator, *by way of a Dialogue bringing them vpon the stage.* §. 9. pag. 30

The third part sheweth that P. R. *hath not performed his challenge in respect either of his cause or conscience.* §. 10. pag. 34

That the very Title of the booke of Mitigation *is ominous and vnluckie vnto them whom* P. R. *laboureth thereby to defend.* §. 10. pag. 34

That P. R. *betraieth his whole cause in question of Rebellion, by many impossibilities of subiection.* §. 11. pag. 36. *shewing his*

ſportfull or rather execrable impoſtureſhip therein. pag.39
That P. R. hath by neceſſarie conſequence ouerthrowne his whole defence of mentall Æquiuocation. §. 12. pag.43
A generall anſwer to the accuſation which P. R. vrgeth concerning malicious falſhoods. §. 13. pag. 49
The hypocriticall, prodigall, and prodigious oſtentation which P. R. maketh in auouching the integritie of his Romiſh writers. §.14.pag. 50
Popes falſificatours. pag.51.num.57
A notable ſpectacle of manifold contradictions of Romiſh Doctors in peruerting three teſtimonies of antiquitie in one controuerſie about Images.pag. 52. as namely the Councell of Eliberis.pag. 53. the Councell of Francford, pag. 55. the Epiſtle of Epiphanius. pag. 59
An inſtance in a notable Romiſh falſificatour, to wit, Cardinall Bellarmine. §. 15. both in ſlandering his aduerſaries, pag.62 and alſo in the corrupt allegation of teſtimonies of Fathers, §. 16. pag. 66. by many examples euen in one controuerſie of Purgatorie. pag.68
Another notable Romiſh falſificator, euen P. R. himſelfe. §. 17 pag.71
One falſhood of his, about the clauſe of Reſeruation. pag.72
A ſecond, in turning one Doctor into many Doctors. pag.72
A third and fourth in changing condemnation into iuſtification.pa. 73.num.82.83
A ſift, in changing Campian into Bellarmine. pag.74.num.84
A ſixt, in changing a deniall into a confeſſion. pag. 75. num.85
A ſeuenth, in changing an interrogation [Haue you any thing to ſay to their practiſe?] into an aſſeueration, & a manifeſt noting an obiection into an hypocriticall diſſimulation.pag. 76.nu.86
An eight falſitie changing Holinſhed into Fox. pag. 79. num.88
A ninth, noting falſly a corruption of the Engliſh text. pag. 81. num.90
A tenth, eleuenth and twelfth. pag.82
A thirteenth falſitie in his claime of vniuerſall conſent for the doctrine of Equiuocation.pag.82.num.93. wherin he is conuinced of notorious falſhoods by the knowne teſtimonies of three Ieſuits,

as Azorius, pa. 84. num. 96. by Emmanuel Sà and others, pag. 86. num. 98. by Maldonate. pag. 99

Answers to the particular accusations of falshood which P. R. hath falsly obiected to T. M. and wherein he hath gloried and insulted most. pag. 88. §. 18

First his insultation in the testimonie of Polydor, concerning the change of Popes names. pag. 89. num. 101

A second insultation in the testimony of Nauclerus, concerning the Pope choaked with a flie. pag. 91. num. 104

A third insultation in the testimonie of Bouchier, de iusta abdicatione, concerning killing of Tyrants. pag. 95. num. 108

A fourth, in the testimonie of M. Reinolds. pag. 99. num. 115

A fift out of Gratian. pag. 103. num. 120

A sixt also out of Gratian. pag. 106. num. 124

A seuenth concerning the text of Esay 29. pag. 109. num. 129

An eighth concerning the testimonie alleged of the Extrauagants. pag. 109. num. 130

A ninth in the testimonie of Bellarm. about putting in Illos, and putting out Hoc. pag. 112. num. 134

A tenth in the testimonie of Carerius about vero and verè, &c. pag. 115. num. 138

An eleuenth in the testimonie of Dolman. pag. 116. num. 139

A twelfth about the succession of Protestant Princes. pag. 116 num. 140

A thirteenth in the testimonie of Frisingensis. pag. 117. num. 141

A fourteenth and most rigorous accusation in the testimonie of Lambertus Scaffnaburg. pag. 117. num. 142. &c.

The falshood, foolishnesse, vnfortunatenesse, and impietie of that Accusation. pag. 120. 121. 123. 124

A challenge against P. R. §. 19. pag. 126. num. 150. &c.

Lambertus Scafnaburg. pag. 17. num. 142. &c.

A PREAMBLE VNTO THE INCOVNTER WITH *P. R. in Confutation of his deceitfull* Treatiſe of MITIGATION.

§. 1.

1 EVery man reprehending his Aduerſarie, thereby bindeth himſelfe to good behauior: otherwiſe to reproch another in his owne guilt, is to throw duſt againſt the wind, which will reflect and returne with greater violence vpon his own face. My Aduerſarie P. R. to make me odious to his Reader hath plaſhed me, as it were, with theſe aſperſions, of *Aſſe, Silly fellow, Vnlearned, Not vnderſtanding Logike, Shameleſſe, Falſe, Malicious*; which a man would thinke he could not haue ſpoken without preſuming of his owne Wit, Learning, Truth, Modeſty, Charity, together with all their complements in himſelfe. In oſtentation whereof he offereth himſelfe to the triall of all Diuines, Schooles, Vniuerſities, and euery Reader of his Treatiſe. But I (alas) what ſhall I ſay? who ſhall plead my cauſe? who? though all Diuines ſhould condemne, Nobilitie diſdaine, and Vniuerſities hiſſe me out of Schooles, yet is there one, vnto whom I dare appeale, euen P. R. himſelfe in his Booke of MITIGATION; where I finde, that this my moſt rigorous Aduerſarie will

proue my rightfull Aduocate; his wit freeing me from fillineſſe, his learning from ignorance, his modeſtie from ſhameleſneſſe, his charitie from malice, his truth from lying. And though he vilifie me with termes of indignitie and tread vpon me with his dirtie footings, as men do vpon braſſe, I ſhall not be greatly offended, being aſſured that the more he rubbeth, the brighter I ſhall appeare both in my cauſe and conſcience vnto euerie Chriſtian and conſcionably affected Reader.

2 To this purpoſe I diuide this *Preamble* into Three Inquiries: The Firſt is, What ſufficiencie and excellencie there is in P. R. to make ſo great an inſultation as he doth: The Second, Whether he may be thought a ſufficient Proctor in this caſe or no: The Third, Whether he hath ſufficiently performed his taske either for the Defenſe of his cauſe or Iuſtification of his conſcience: together with a Challenge againſt him in them both.

THE FIRST INQVIRIE.

The true Symptomes and Arguments concerning the ſufficiencie and excellencie of the wit, memorie, learning, charitie, modeſtie, and truth, of P. R. by a taſte in ech one, euen in ſuch inſtances, wherein he glorieth and boaſteth moſt.

An Argument of P. R. his kinde of wit, which may ſeeme to haue beene a ſlumber when he made his Replie.

§. 2.

3 LOquere vt te videam, that is, *Speake friend, that I may ſee thee*, ſayd the Philoſopher vnto a yong man; becauſe (*Oratio*, being *oris ratio*) the reaſon of man can not be outwardly diſcerned better than by the mouth, which is the meſſenger of the heart. Therfore let vs ſee P. R. ſpeaking thus:

The chiefe proofe of Thomas Morton (to shew our Priests to be bad Doctors) consisteth in a certaine comparing of them with those Iewish Priests of the olde law, in Christs time, who taught the souldiers which watched at the Sepulcher of our Saviour to say, That whilest they were sleeping, his Disciples came and stole him away. [Common sense (sayth Thomas Morton) might haue replied, How could you tell what was done when you were asleepe? But mindes inthralled in the opinion of a neuer-erring Priesthood (which confirmed that answer) could not possibly but erre with their Priests. Such (alas) is the case of all them &c.] Doe you see how substantially he hath prooued this matter? Let vs examine the particulars: First the storie, then the inference. About the storie S. Matthew recounteth in the 28. Chapter of his Gospell, how Christ our Saviour being raised miraculously from death to life with a great and dreadfull earth-quake and descent of an Angell, so as the souldiers which kept the Sepulcher were astonished, and almost dead for feare; some of them ranne and tolde the Chiefe Priests thereof, who making a consultation with the Elders, deuised this shift, To giue them store of money, and to bidde them say, That in the night when they were asleepe his Disciples came and stole him away: and so they did. And S. Matthew addeth, That this false bruit ran currant among the Iewes, euen vntill that time wherein he wrote his Gospell. This is the narration. What hath Tho. Morton now to say to this against vs? for thereunto is all his drift. First, he sayth, as you haue heard, That this deuice was improbable, and against common sense it selfe. Common sense (sayth hee) might haue replied (to the souldiers) What could you tell what was done when you were asleepe? See heere the sharpnesse of Tho. Mortons wit aboue that of the Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees. But what if one of the souldiers had replied to him thus? We saw it not when we were asleepe, but afterward when wee were awakened wee perceiued hee was stollen away. What reioynder would our Minister make? As for example, if Tho. Morton were walking with a Communion-booke vnder his arme thorow a field, and wearied should lie downe to sleepe with his Booke by his side, and at his awaking should see his Booke gone, were it against common sense for him to say, That his booke was

[a] The treatise of *Mitigat.* Epist. Ded. to the Vniuersit. num. 24.

»» *stollen from him while he was asleepe? Or is not this an Assertion*
»» *fit for one of those Doctours, whereof S. Paul talketh, that vnder-*
»» *stand not what they say, nor whereof they affirme? But this will*
»» *better yet appeare by the second point, which is his inference.*

4 The Minister hath only this to reioyne, That his Aduersarie P. R. hath shewed himselfe, by this his Inference, both shameleſſe and witleſſe. Shameleſſe, to impute that for an abſurditie vnto me, which he might haue knowen to be the wiſe and learned Inference of ancient Fathers, amongſt whom S. *Auguſtine* ſayth to this Anſwer of theſe ſouldiers thus: [b] *O mali, ô peſſimi, aut vigilabatis, aut dormiebatis; & quid ſit factum neſcitis: impletum eſt enim quod à Spiritu Sancto multùm antè per* * *Pſalmiſtam prædictum erat, Cogitauerunt conſilium, quod non potuerunt ſtabilire.* That is to ſay, *O euill and moſt wicked men, either you were awake or aſleepe, and knew not what was done, &c.* intimating this Dilemma; Either were you awake or aſleepe: if awake, then confeſſe what was done, *Chriſt is riſen out of the graue*: if aſleepe, *then you knew not what was done.* For ſay, I pray you, P. R. When Chriſt by the power of his Godhead raiſed himſelfe out of the graue, had it beene a good anſwer of the ſouldiers (ſuppoſing they had ſlept) to ſay, *We know that Chriſt was ſtollen out of the graue*, when we were aſleepe, becauſe we found him not when we were awake? This Inference P. R. doth holde for good: whereby my Reader may gheſſe how acceptable a ſeruant he would haue been vnto thoſe Iewiſh Prieſts, if he had liued in that Synagogue; in ſetting on foot that bruit of infidelitie, by perſwading the people, that the ſouldiers reaſon was good; the Concluſion whereof is, *Chriſt did not riſe; but was ſtollen out of the graue*: though, I hope, P. R. his faith is not ſo farre aſleepe, as ſo to preiudice the chiefe Article of Chriſtian faith, The reſurrection of Chriſt from the dead: without which, as the Apoſtle S. Paul teacheth, * *our preaching is vaine, and faith vaine.*

[b] *Aug. tom. 10. homil. 36. ad finem.*

* Pſal. 20.

P. R. groſly ignorant in Diuinitie.

* 1. Cor. 15.

5 Howſoeuer, I am ſure he hath ſhewen himſelfe heerin very witleſſe, who knowing that I ſet downe the maine queſtion in theſe words in great letters, for diſtinction ſake, *His Diſciples came and ſtole him away*: ſpecifying the perſons, *His Diſciples*, the

the principall subiect of that question: And could sleeping souldiers tell what was done of Christs Disciples? As for example, If I falling asleepe in the field, and hauing twentie shillings in my purse, one should come and picke my pocket, and cut my purse; after, I awaking, and conuenting P. R. before a Magistrate vpon suspition of felonie, should yeeld no other reason, but that when I was asleepe, sure I am, P. R. came and cut my purse. Then the Iustice of Peace replieth, How know you that P. R. did it, you being then asleepe? What reioynder would P. R. teach *Tho. Morton* to make? I could haue vexed P. R. with a more familiar example, if I had beene bent to scurrilitie. It is sufficient to vnderstand, that as it pleased God so to infatuate that lying Priesthood, when they thought themselues most wise, for the greater glory of Christian faith, as to build their incredulitie vpon no better foundation than a fained senseleſſe report of men asleepe: euen so it falleth out with my Aduersary P. R. who hath bewraied his singular sottishnesse in the Inference, wherein he meant to giue vs a speciall Argument of his wit.

P. R. confuted by the Text.

An Argument of the rare memorie of P. R. bewraying his free-will to lying.

§. 3.

6 TO make me seeme ridiculously cautelous, as intending whensoeuer their Equiuocating forgerie was to be spoken of, to keepe the clause of mentall reseruation vnder a Latine locke, and not Englished, lest weake ones might learne to practise that Magicall Art, P. R. opposeth hereunto, "*He (meaning Tho. Morton) hath not to my remembrance set downe the clause of Reseruation in Latine but once thorowout all his booke, and that in foure words in the second page, the sayd Reseruation being mentioned in English more perhaps than fourteene times.*" a Treatis. Mitigat. Ep. Ded to the Vniuersit. num. 21.

7 If my Reader will be willing for my sake to lose so much time as to peruse but the places which I haue noted, he shall

finde the clause of Reseruation set downe by [d] *me* in English not aboue [e] three or foure times thorow my whole Booke, and in the Treatise professedly written of that subiect of Equiuocation it is (the thing it selfe challenging so much) but once: but it is couched in Latine phrase aboue twentie times. See the *Full Satisfact. Part.* 3. [f] First, [1] *Vt quis teneatur illud detegere.* Second, [2] *Vt tibi dicam.* [3] *Vt tibi reuelem*: in one Chapter. [4] *Vt tibi significem.* [5] *Vt tibi reuelem.* [6] *Vt tibi narrem.* [7] *Vt narrem tibi.* [8] *Vt narrem tibi*: fiue times in one Chapter. Againe, [9] *Vt tibi significem.* [10] *Vt tibi significem.* [11] *Quatenus vir longissimè abesse potuit.* [12] *Vt in commune bonum conferamus.* [13] *Vt alijs largiamur.* [14] *Vt vobis significemus*: and [15] *Vt narrem tibi.* [16] *Venit in Purgatorio.* [17] *Vt tibi reuelem.* [18] *Vt tibi reuelem*; foure times in one Chap. and [19] *Vt dicam vobis.* [20] *Vt dicam vobis*; *vt vobis significem.* [21] *Vt vobis significem.* [22] *Abomni spe obtinendi Rom. Imperium.* [23] *Admodùm exiguam.* Thus often it is expressly set downe euen in those places whereunto P. R. himselfe hath shaped such Answers as his want of grace did permit: so that he could not pretend ignorance heerein. Wherefore what this his so open lying might portend, I know not, except he felt his wit wax somewhat blunt, and therefore meant to deserue the whetstone.

8 The excellencie of his memorie appeareth in this, that he could remember *fourteene* English clauses of the Reseruation, where there was (I thinke) not aboue foure: but of twenty Latine clauses he would remember but *one*. Now seeing that one instance doth confute a generall assertion, as he that shall say, There is not any Stew allowed in Rome, is easily confuted if but one may be prooued to be there: He therefore wilfully denying that there is any such Latine clause, excepting only *one*, must, vpon the euidence of three and twentie more, be thought to haue made two and twentie lies at once. And shall we expect, that when he is brought into exigents and straits of greater importance, that he will speake truth, who doth lie so lauishly in a matter so needlesse? No, for an horse is like to stumble in the rough way, who falleth flat of all foure in the plaine. Next followeth

[d] As for those set downe in the *Moderate Answer*, I am not to answer.

[e] See *Satisfac. part.* 1. *c.* 17. *lit.* (a) & *lit.* (e.) And *Part.* 3. *c.* 3. *lit.* (b)

[f] 1. 2. See *Satisfact. Part.* 3. *c.* 1. *lit.* (c) the 3. in chap. 2. the 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. in the chap. 3. the 9. 10. in the chap. 4. the 11. in cha. 5. the 12. 13. 14. in the cha. 7. the 15. 16. 17. 18. in cha. 8. the 19. 20. 21. in the chap. 11. the 22. 23. in the chap. 13.

Forty

An Argument of P. R. his kinde of learning in Logike, wherein he hath prouoked all Vniuerſities in the world to laugh at him.

§. 4.

9 FOr proofe of his dexteritie in Logike, he taketh vpon him to diſcuſſe an abſurd *Syllogiſme* (as he calleth it) of *Tho. Mortons*, in this maner. [s] *His Syllogiſme* (ſayth he) *is in theſe words:* [*The competencie of God, by whom we ſweare, maketh euery one competent Iudges and Hearers, to whom we ſweare. But by ſwearing by God, whom we can not deceiue, we religiouſly proteſt, that in ſwearing we intend not to deceiue. Ergo your deceitfull Equiuocation is a prophanation of the religious worſhip of God.*] *This Syllogiſme I leaue to be diſcuſſed by Cambridge Logicians, where I peare ſay the man learned his Logike (if he haue any) for heere he ſheweth very little or none at all, no boy being among us of foure moneths ſtanding in Logike or Sophiſtrie, which will not hiſſe at this argument, both for forme and matter. — — — Becauſe it hath ſix terminos, — and there ſhould be but three. For it is no more a Syllogiſme than this: viz.*

[k] *Euery man is a liuing creature:*
Euery Ox is a foure-footed beaſt:
Ergo euery Aſſe hath two long eares. Where you ſee there be ſix termini, as in Tho. Mortons Syllogiſme, without connexion or dependance one of the other. And as much concludeth this as that. — And now compare this his skill (I pray you) with that brag of his in the beginning of his Treatiſe againſt Equiuocation, when he ſayd to his Aduerſary, Dare you appeale to Logike? This is the Art of Arts, and the high tribunall of reaſon and trueth it ſelfe, which no man in any matter, whether it be caſe of Humanity or Diuinity, can iuſtly refuſe. *Who would not thinke but that the man were very skilfull in that Art, wherein he preſumeth to giue ſuch a cenſure?*

10 I would gladly doe my Aduerſary the credit, as to thinke that not he himſelfe, but rather ſome of his *boyiſh Sophiſters* hath

[s] Treatiſ. *Mitig. cap.* 11. *pag.* 473. & 474. *num.* 50. 51. 52. 53.

[k] *q. ſup. pag.* 475. *num.* 52. P. R. his Thraſonicall inſultation.

hath thus cauilled that silly Argument, but that thorowout his whole Booke I finde him so prodigall of his wit, time, and paper, euery where pleasing himselfe in such superfluous vanities. Here therefore he calleth that a *Syllogisme*, which I named only in a more generall terme a *Reason*, and not a Syllogisme. Now there be many formes of reasonings besides *Syllogismes*; neither did I, indeed, intend to make an exact and formall Syllogisme, but only such an Argument, which by due inference and deduction might proue my Conclusion good: and P. R. confesseth of that my Argument, that by a double *Inference the reasoning is made good*. I can not see therefore what cause he had to be more offended at me for deliuering that in grosse, which being diuided into his parts was *good reasoning*; no more than a man may mislike to-pence because it is not a couple of single pence. As for his example of a Syllogisme, it can not admit any such Inference to make any *good reasoning*: for by what deduction can he make his *creature man* and his other creature *asse with long eares* meet? But how will P. R. now vse mee vpon this aduantage? [1] *I do shew him* (sayth he) *to be a silly Disputer, as that he knoweth not how to make a Syllogisme, and therefore am forced to send him againe to Cambridge to reforme his Logike, and to learne more.* O good Sir, deale not so extremly with me, to put me to that trouble, charge, and shame, but rather vouchsafe (I pray you) to teach me your selfe, you shall finde me docible I warrant you. P. R. [k] *Now then let vs helpe him out to make his foresayd Syllogisme in forme. It should haue beene thus, if he would haue sayd any thing in true forme:*

The competency of God, by whom we sweare, maketh euery one competent Iudges, to whom we sweare:

But in euery oath we sweare by God either expressly or implicatiuely:

Ergo in euery oath they are competent Iudges, to whom we sweare.

And then by another inference againe, he might haue argued, That vnto euery competent and lawfull Iudge we haue confessed before that a man is bound to answer directly, and to sweare to his intention,

[1] *Mitig.* Epist. Dedic. to the Vniuersities, num. 17. P. R. amplifieth his owne vanitie.

[k] *Mitig. sup. lit. E. pa. 475. num. 53.* P. R. frameth a Syllogisme.

I spare the examination of this second in-

sion, and not only to his owne. Ergo in no oath to whomsoeuer, may a man equiuocate, which is his principall Proposition. And thus had his forme of reasoning beene good, according to the rules of Logike.

11 If there had beene either sinew or sappe of Logike in this Priest, it stood him vpon heere to expresse his best Art, where he meaneth to play his prize, especially now when so scornfully he insulteth vpon his Aduersarie, and so confidently appealeth vnto Vniuersities, as though he would heerupon raise his *Io pæan* and triumph. Had we not now reason to expect as absolute a Syllogisme as all his wit, art, and industrie could inuent? I am not woorthy (I confesse) to enter in comparison with men of great learning, because I thinke my selfe inferiour vnto thousands in our owne Kingdome, yet some Logike I haue learned, and sometime publikely taught; vpon which little I dare presume to make a generall appeale to *Cambridge, Oxford, Rhemes, Rome*, and vnto all Vniuersities, whether of Protestants or Romanists, whether Christian or Pagan, yea, euen to his owne hissing boyes and Sophisters, who *P. R.* sayth *are able to make Syllogismes in one moneth*, and challenge *P. R.* for this his false Syllogisme, willing (if he dare) that heerupon wee venture our degrees, which wee haue taken in the Schooles. To come to the point: This Syllogisme can finde no place either in *mood* or *figure*, by reason of foure capitall faults. First, there be in it fiue *termini*, as namely, [1] *competencie*: [2] *God by whom we sweare*: [3] *euery one competent Iudges to whom we sweare*: [4] *in euery oath*: [5] *either expresly or implicatiuely*: whereas, according to his owne censure, there should be but three. Secondly, these words, *The competencie*, being part of the *Medium*, should haue beene repeated in the *Minor* proposition, thus: *But in euery oath there is a competencie of God by whom we sweare*. Otherwise it is no better than if *P. R.* should dispute thus:

Euery *Mitigation* of doctrine concerning rebellious positions, which are imputed vnto vs, will procure vs fauour of the State:

But this is the doctrine of rebellious positions imputed vnto vs:

„ ference, leauing this
„ labour to his Sophisters, which will make the sport.

The manifold absurdities of his Syllogisme.

Ergo this doctrine of rebellious positions imputed vnto vs will procure vs fauour of the State.

The fault in this Syllogisme is because this word, *Mitigation*, which is part of the *Medium*, is not repeated in the *Minor*. Thirdly, there should be but one *minus extremum*: with this, *We sweare by God*, he hath ioyned another in these words, *either expresly or implicatiuely*: which words being a part of the *minus extremum*, should not haue beene omitted in the Conclusion. Like as if a man should reason thus:

Euery penitent Confessarie must receiue absolution:

But euery Drunkard is a penitent Confessarie, repenting either of drinking too much, or of drinking too little:

Ergo, euery Drunkard must receiue absolution.

The fault of this is the addition to the *minus extremum* [either for drinking too much, or too little.] The fourth, the Verbe and *copula* [*maketh*] *euery one competent*, is altered in the Conclusion into [*Are*] *competent Iudges*: than the which there can not be a greater absurditie in Syllogismes. As may appeare by this like example.

Euery man in framing his last Will and Testament, maketh his owne Executor:

But T. B. frameth his last Will and Testament:

Ergo T. B. is his owne Executor.

The fault is the changing of the *copula* or Verbe [*maketh*] into [*is.*] What will now *P. R.* doe, after that this his montanous boast of *A true Syllogisme* hath brought foorth this ridiculous mouse? It is to be feared, that his *hissing Sophisters* will turne him into a Prouerbe, for thus disgracing their College, calling him *P. R. the Syllogizer*, when they will note any man so egregiously absurd, as in his greatest vaunt of skill to bewray his greatest want. But I may not be so vnthankefull as not to reforme him, who was so willing to helpe me; thereby to redeeme him from scorne: and therefore wish him to frame his *Syllogisme* thus:

Euery speech, wherein we sweare by God, either expresly or implicatiuely, doth by the competencie of God, by whom we sweare, make the Iudges competent, vnto whom we sweare:

But euery oath is a speech wherein we sweare by God, either expresly or implicatiuely:

Ergo, euery oath doth by the competencie of God, by whom we sweare, make the Iudges competent, to whom we sweare.

12 But I feare lest I may seeme too much to detract from his skill in Logike, who hath giuen vs so many tokens of his rare facultie therin, especially in exact *dividing and subdiuiding*; a principall property of that Art. As for example: *Wherfore all our speech, saith he, in this place shal be about the second kind of Equiuocation, which is false and lying, and thereby also euer vnlawful; which though not properly, yet in a general maner, may be called Equiuocation, as I haue said, for that the hearer is alwayes wrongfully deceiued or intended to be deceiued by some falsitie, which is knowen to be such by the speaker, and consequently is plaine lying. And for that lying also hath beene shewed before to be diuided into two sorts; the one a materiall lie, when the thing spoken is false in it selfe, but not so vnderstood by the speaker; the other a formall lie, when the speaker doth know it, or thinketh it to be false, and yet speaketh it. This kinde of Æquiuocation, which really is a lie, must haue also the same subdiuision, so as the one sort thereof may be called a materiall lying Equiuocation, and the other a formall: and so much woorse, as a formall lie is in it selfe (which alwayes is sinne) than a materiall (which oftentimes may be without sinne of the speaker) by so much is a formall lying Equiuocation worse than a materiall.* There is no boy (I thinke) in his College, but hee can analyse the members of this diuision thus:

1. *Mitigat.* chap. 12. num. 4. pag. 485. initio.

A fond diuision of P.R.

A lying Equiuocation is that which *is known to be such vnto the speaker*. And this is to be subdiuided, for it is either

- *A materiall lie*, which is when the thing spoken is a lie in it selfe, *But not so vnderstood of the speaker.*
- Or, *A formall lie*, when the speaker *Doth know it, and thinke it to be false.*

Where he maketh a materiall lie, which *is not knowen of the speaker*, to be a species or member of that *lying aequiuocation, which is knowen to the speaker*. As if hee should say, *Some lier knoweth what he speaketh*, when he *knoweth not what he speaketh.*

And could any say thus, but a lier? Heere indeed is Logike whereat the boies of our *Vniuersities* may hisse, and the boies of his College may blush; yea, any rurall boy (if of any meane capacitie) may laugh, by sight of the like: for his diuision is all one as if he had sayd thus:

Euery one of our Priests is shauen in the crowne, whereof { Some are sent into England, and they haue no shauen crownes. Others remaine beyond the seas, and they are shauen in the crownes.

Which diuision if it were true, then might a man conclude by good Logike, that a man with a shauen crowne hath no shauen crowne. And yet *P. R.* our great Logicioner can tell vs, „ that * *According to Aristotles obseruation, Prudentis est distin-* „ *guere: It appertaineth to a wise and discreet man to distinguish,* „ *whereas the ignorant, and the vnlearned doth commonly confound* „ *all without distinction.* But my friend *P. R.* (I must needs say) is not one of those *Ignorants*, who confound things without distinction; but woorse: for he hath taken paines to confound things by distinguishing. I can not be delighted with these kinde of taxations, and except it were against such a scornfull Aduersarie, I would not haue insisted vpon them. My purpose is only to teach him hereafter to be more serious, who still multiplieth his vanities, as next appeareth in

* *Mitigat.* Epist. Ded. vnto the Vniuersit. num. 3.

An Argument of his kinde of skill in Greeke *and* Hebrew, *whereby he hath gained the opinion of rare ignorance.*

§. 5.

13 YEt againe, to expose me to the scoffe of his Reader, the conceired Gentleman sayth thus: * *And yet truly* „ *I can not well pretermit, for ending this Chapter, one little note* „ *more, of rare singularitie in this man aboue others, which I scarse* „ *euer haue obserued in any of his fellowes, and this is, That the very*

* *Mitigat. cha. 2. pag. 38. num. 58.*

first

first words of Scripture alleged by him in the first page of his booke, for the poesie of his pamphlet, are falsly alleged, corrupted and mangled, though they conteine but one only verse of Isay the Prophet; and then may you imagine, what libertie he will take to himselfe afterward thorowout his whole Discourse. His sentence or poesie is this. Isay. 29. vers. 9. But stay your selues and woonder, they are blinde and make you blinde: *which he would haue to be understood of vs Catholikes. But let any man reade the place of Isay it selfe, & he shall finde no such matter either in words or sense, but only the word,* wonder, *to wit; Obstupescite & admiramini, fluctuate & vacillate, inebriamini & non a vino, mouemini & non ab ebrietate. And according to this are the Greeke and Hebrew texts also. So as what should moone T. M. to set downe so corruptly the very sentence of his booke, and cite the chapter and verse wherein his fraud may be discried, I know not, except he obserued not the last clause of the Prophets precept, Mouemini & non ab ebrietate. And so much for this.*

14 Which is *much* more than any man of a temperate sense would haue obiected: for *let any man reade* the English translation, and he shall finde the same *words* expresly set downe. Seeing therefore that *T. R.* doth intimate to his Reader, That I haue forged a new Text, and that *the words are* by me *falsly alleged*, can there be a more false, yea and (if wilfull rashnesse doe not take the vpper hand of impudent boldnesse) a more shamelesse cauill than this?

15 Thus much of the words, *Ye are blinde, &c.* His next quarrell is against the sense, he repeating the Latine, yet but *manglingly*, and doth not English it, lest (I thinke) his common Reader might apprehend the sense: or els he left it for me to translate. Thus then: **Be ye astonished & wonder, wauer ye and reele, ye are drunke, but not with wine, ye are moued, but not with drunkennesse: because the Lord hath mingled for you the spirit of slumber, he will shut your eyes, he will couer your Prophets and chiefe ones, which see visions, &c.* The sense of all is deliuered by S. Hierome in his Comment vpon the same place: *Scitote ergo, &c. Know therefore ye Scribes and Pharisees, who are the chiefe among the Iewes, for you hearing the Lord*

* Isa. 29.

Hierom. Com. in Isa. 29.

and Sauiour would not vnderstand, and haue shut your eyes, that you should not see: Therefore will God shut your eyes (who are the Prophets) by whom you receiued the knowledge of God. A little after: *Or according to the Septuagints, he will shut the eyes of them, who boasted they saw secrets, &c.* In all these we heare of the *spirit of slumber*, of *couering* and *shutting of eyes*, of *not seeing*: and can these signifie any thing but a spirituall blindnesse? Againe, *Pagninus* translateth the text according to our English: *Excecati &c. They are blinde, and make you blinde.* And not this only, but their owne late authorized Doct. *Pintus*, in his Comment vpon the same place, sayth: *In Hebraeo est in hunc modum, &c. Thus it is in the Hebrew text* (sayth he) *Your Priests shall be blinde, and make others blinde.*

P. R. his arrogancie in vrging the Greeke and Hebrew text.

Pagninus.

Pintus.

16 Let vs conferre circumstances together. First, I am noted by P. R. to haue forged a text, but am acquitted by the English Translation, *They are blinde, &c.* This then is his first falshood. And next, for his sense he obiecteth the Latine and Greeke, but by the exposition of *S. Hierome* both the Greeke Septuagints and Latine vulgar haue the same sense, to wit, *Shutting vp of eyes*, which is to be blinde: which may argue his second falshood. In the last place he opposeth the *Hebrew* text, as different from the English, which by the iudgement of *Pagninus*, and *Pintus*, is almost the same both in words & sense, wherein is discouered his third falshood. So as I can not ghesse what mooued *P. R.* to deale so slanderously with me, in noting me of *fraud and corruption*, except it be that he meant we should recken himselfe in the number of these Priests thus mentioned in the Text, *You are blinde, and make men blinde*; or in the words following, *You are drunke but not with wine*: With what then? I pray God I may not say with malice. In this, both P. R. and I may learne a caution, to take heed wee doe not peremptorily meddle with Hebrew texts: for if they say true who know him, as I can say of my selfe, we are but *Alephbethurians* in this language.

An Argument of P. R. his kinde of Charitie, attended with a triumphant falſhood.

§. 6.

17. I Doe not meane to bring in, as tokens heereof, his diſgracefull and reuiling termes, calling mee *Aſſe*, *Silly graſhopper*, *Lewd lad*: which kinde of Rhetorike the learned call *Caninam eloquentiam*, that is, *Doggiſh eloquence*, wherein this fellow hath (I muſt confeſſe) a ſingular gift, which I ſhall rather pitie than enuie, till I ſee it better imployed. In the interim it can not offend mee to be called *Aſſe* in that cauſe, wherein I carrie my Sauiour in his *Hoſanna*; nor to be termed *Graſhopper* in that cauſe, wherein I may be a plague vnto Ægypt, I pray God rather for conuerſion than deſtruction: nor to be named *Lad*, whileſt I carrie a ſtone in a ſling, *In nomine Domini*, wherewith a noble and gracious Lad did hit an enemie of the true worſhip of God, a vaunting *Goliah*, in the forehead. But I haue a better argument of his charitable deuotion towards me than this. For thus *P. R.* ° *I let paſſe as trifles in this very place (but yet ſuch as ſhew a guilty minde and meaning) that he citing the booke of* Alexander Carerius, *a Doctor of the Canon law in Padua, which he wrote of late* De poteſtate Romani Pontificis, *putteth in of his owne*, contra huius temporis hæreticos, *againſt the heretikes of this time, which are not in the title of that booke. And then whereas the ſayd Author, naming or citing many other Writers to be of his opinion, doth ſay*, Nuperrimè verò Celſus Mancinus in tract. de Iurib. Princip. &c. *and laſt of all* Celſus Mancinus *doth holde the ſame in a certaine Treatiſe of the rights and principalities: this man to frame vnto himſelfe ſome matter of inſultation, turneth* verò *into* verè, *and then playeth ridiculouſly vpon his owne fiction in theſe words: Carerius* citeth another called *Celſus*, by interpretation high or lofty, and therefore inſtiles him with *Verè Celſus*, as truly ſo named, and ſo truly he may be, if we iudge him by the loftineſſe of his ſtile and Concluſion. *So he. And doe you ſee this folly? Or will you thinke*

° Treatiſ. of *Mitigat.* cha. 6. num. 60. pag. 234.

„ *thinke it rather follie than falshood, that could not discerne be-*
„ *tweene* verò *and* verè ? *Or not be able to iudge by the contex-*
„ *ture of* Carerius *his speech it selfe, that it could not by apt con-*
„ *struction be* verè *if he had lighted vpon a corrupt copie, as he could*
„ *not; for that there is but one, and that hath very plainly* verò, *and*
„ *consequently all this Commentarie of* Tho. Morton *is out of his*
„ *owne inuention. And where now is the* assurance of his vpright
„ conscience *protested to his Maiestie in his Epistle Dedicatorie?*
„ *Where is his* simplicitie in Christ Iesus ? *Where is his* naked in-
„ nocencie ? *Can this be ignorance ? Can this be done but of pur-*
„ *pose, and consequently by a guiltie conscience? What may the Hea-*
„ *rer beleeue of all he sayth, when euery where he is found intangled*
„ *with such foolish treachery ? But let vs proceed.* Thus farre *P.R.*

18 It is but a point of Oratory in this man to say he *letteth passe*, which notwithstanding he insisteth and dwelleth vpon as violently and virulently as vpon any one taxation in the whole booke, and yet the matter, we see, is but only about *trifles*, as himselfe sayth, and therefore such, as not only Christian equitie, but euen common humanitie might haue either spared: or if I deserued correction, yet with moderate Schoolmasters to know when to vse a ferula, and when a rod. The
„ fault obiected is a wrong intituling of a booke, which not-
„ withstanding the title which *P.R.* allegeth (being *De Pontifice Romano*) might haue born out, because it is the very scope
„ of that booke: so that my errour therein could haue beene no
„ more than if in signes which hang in the street, I had taken an Iuie bush for an Hollie, both which doe equally betoken a
„ Tauerne. The next excuse might haue beene from a possible
A forced and strained calumniation. weakenesse of sight in taking *vere* for *verò*. But this mans charitie is so hote, that whatsoeuer slip his Aduersarie maketh, it must rather be *falshood* than *follie*. Must it be euen so then
„ P.R ? And shall the Minister finde no more fauourable con-
„ struction at the hands of a Priest, than to be pronounced guil-
„ tie of forgerie for such an easie escape, not of a sentence, or
„ word, or syllable, but for this little element *ò* ? ô then giue me
„ leaue to plead for my selfe, and know *P. R.* that the Booke it
„ selfe will witnesse against you, which many haue seene in my

hands,

hands, and any may see that will. *Carerius*, then in the Boke aboue mentioned, printed at *Colen, Anno Domini* 1601. *in* 8°. (and ioyned with another booke of *Zecchius De Indulgentijs & Iubileo*, which hath the first place in the volume) hath in the front and beginning of the whole Booke this title following: viz.

De potestate Romani Pontificis, aduersus impios Politicos, & nostri temporis hæreticos, Authore Alexandro Carerio Patauino. That is:

A Treatise concerning the authoritie of the Pope of Rome, against the wicked Politicians and Heretikes of our times, by Alexander Carerius, &c. Which title is againe repeated alone in the beginning of *Carerius* his *Tract*, after F. 4. *De potestate Romani Pontificis aduersus Politicos & huius temporis hæreticos, &c. A Treatise concerning the authoritie of the Pope against the politicians and heretikes of these times.* I haue therefore committed no fraud in the title.

19 The second is of the particle *Verè*, which is also as plaine in the place by me alleged out of *Carerius lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *pag.* 133. about the middest of the page, before the end of that Chapter, *Nuperrimè verè Celsus Mancinus in Tractat. de iuribus principatuum, &c. Of late truly Celsus Mancinus, &c.* Which the contexture may seeme also to import, because after that he had recounted sixteene Authours for maintenance of his Conclusion, and comming last vnto *Celsus Mancinus*, may well be thought by that particle *verè*, to haue honoured *Celsus* with the note of *Truly loftie*, that by the excellencie of the Authour he might haue gained grace and dignitie to his cause. Where then is the sincerities of this mans conscience? Shall I excuse him by diuersitie of Editions? Hee will not be thus excused: *For* (sayth he) *there is but one Edition.* What *Menippus* (whom the Poets fain to be the man in the moon, beholding all the infinite corners of the world) could haue made so peremptorie a negatiue as this? *There is but one*, that is, there is no other Edition in the world? seeing that it is free for all Vniuersities in France, Spaine, Germanie, Italie to print and re-

A peremptorie falshood of P. R.

print all such priuileged books, and yet *P. R.* dare auouch that there is but *one*. Take heed *P. R.* nay it is past take heed, for you are alreadie fallen into a whirlpoole: becauſe if there be but *one*, then hath *P. R.* wickedly falſified the Author, by turning *verè* into *verò* (which all men may finde in the *Colen* Edition, *anno* 1601. where it is *verè*) if there may be another, then hath he wilfully bolted out this exception, ſaying, that *there is but one Edition*. The guilt of the firſt muſt bee needs malice; of the other, madneſſe: wherby (I hope) my Reader may iudge, that the ſinceritie of my conſcience heerein hath beene where it ought, euen in the heart of a *Minister of Truth*: and that it is no maruell, if the conſcience of my Aduerſarie hath beene (according to his profeſſion) in the heart of an Æquinocator, who ſayth furthermore, *I let that paſſe*, which notwithſtanding euen vpon a wrong ſenſe he proſecuteth in titles and *trifles* ſo curiouſly, or rather (if deſert may ſpeake) ſo curriſhly, and with ſuch ſpightfull inſultations, viz. *Where is his naked innocencie? Where is his vpright conſcience? Where is his ſimplicitie in Christ Ieſus?* And is not this a paſſing treacherie, trow wee? Yet this alſo is excuſable in reſpect of many others, whereof (ſo much as the nature of a preamble may require) I ſhall giue my Reader that taſte, which may prepare him for a ſufficient preſumption of the reſt. But ſome will ſay, in ſo manifeſtly impudence how can any argument of modeſtie appeare? Beholde

An Argument of P. R. his kinde of modeſtie, accompanied with a preſumptuous falſhood.

§ 3.

" TO this my Obiection, [1] *All Popiſh Priests* [illegible] " *aboliſh the title of ſucceſſion in all Proteſtant Princes, by* " *a pretended prerogatiue either of Pope or people*: producing for " proofe of this Popiſh doctrine the teſtimonies of their owne " Doctours, to wit, *Reinolds, Stapleton, Symancha.* Heereunto

[1] See *Full Satisfact.* part. 1. cha. 13. pag. 39.

P. R.

P. R. taketh two exceptions. The first thus: [q] *But let vs see, and consider how falsly and calumnionsly this Makebate doth heer-upon argue in his third Reason, inferring for his Assumption or Minor Proposition thus:* But all Popish Priests vpon this pretended supremacie and prerogatiue of Pope and people doe vtterly abolish the title of succession in all Protestant Princes. Ergo. *Wherein to shew him a notable liar, it shall be sufficient to name all the Protestant Princes that haue had title of succession in our Country (for thereof he speaketh principally) since the name of Protestant hath beene heard of in the world, being three in number, to wit, King Edward the sixt, Queene Elizabeth, and King Iames that now reigneth, all which were admitted peaceably to their Crownes aswell by Priests as Catholike people, who notwithstanding in some of their admissions wanted not meanes to haue wrought disturbances, as the world knoweth: so as if one instance only doth truly ouerthrow any generall proposition, how much more doth this triple instance, not able to be denied, ouerthrow and cast to ground this vniuersall false assertion of T. M. which auerreth,* That all Popish Priests doe vtterly abolish the succession of all Protestant Princes? *Will he not be ashamed to see himselfe conuinced of so great and shameless ouerlashing?*

[q] Treatise of *Mitigat.* cap. 2. pag. 71. nu. 71.

21 What haue I sayd, which I haue not prooued? From the Priest *Reinolds* I reported this testimony, *The right of Kings Christian must depend rather vpon their religion than order of succession, and therefore all Christians must cut off all hope, lest any such* (speaking of Protestants) *may aspire vnto the throne.* Secondly, from *M. Stapleton*, this: *If they doe not withstand such a succession* (speaking of Protestant Kings) *what doe the people els but euen preferre man before God?* Thirdly, from *Symancha*, this: *That if the heire apparent* (speaking of Protestants) *be heretical, then the Catholike Common-wealth may chuse another, and if the Common-wealth be heretical* (noting Protestants) *then the choice belongeth to the Pope, and so the kingdome* (which was to make way for the Spanish Inuasion against England, in 88.) *may be taken by Catholikes.* From which three testimonies (besides that of *Dolman*, which followeth)

[r] *Full satisfact.* part. 1. chap. 13. pag. 39.

loweth) I made bolde to conclude a generall, That all *Romish* Priests are of the same opinion: and am therefore censured for a *notable liar*: his reason, *Because three Protestant Princes haue beene peaceably admitted vnto the Crowne, when yet there wanted no meanes of disturbance.* It can not be but that this *P. R.* when he calleth any man *liar*, doth presently licke his owne lips, as we may perceiue by his strong breath: for first, I reported not mine owne coniectures, but the expresse positions of their owne principall Doctors, finding no one of that side, writing of our English cause, to holde the contrary.

A calumnious falshood.

22 Which is heerein more apparently the generall doctrine of all their Priests, in as much as this Priest *P. R.* euen now, when the case challenged him to answer concerning that doctrine, yet neither could oppose, of the infinite number of all his crew, any one Priest who euer set pen to paper to confute that doctrine, neither durst he in this answer condemne it himselfe. And therefore where my question is *Deiure*, that is, of the doctrine, Whether their Priests thinke it lawfull for subiects to admit a Protestant Prince, and heire apparent, to succession, he answereth *De facto*, that is, *of the euents of things that happened*, to wit, That three Protestant Princes haue been quietly permitted to succeed, giuing his Reader an almes of a piece of chalke for a morsell of cheese. As for example: It is a law amongst theeues (no one of them holding the contrary) not alwayes to robbe, when they may make disturbance, but then only, when they are in most probable hope to enioy their prey: so that it falleth out many times, that when they meet with passengers, they entertaine kinde and courteous talke with them, and yet dogge them on their way, with purpose to rob them in some presumed place of aduantage: but then by the sight of more company of true men they, being frustrate of their hope, let them passe without any maner of disturbance. If, notwithstanding such escape, any shall affirme, that all theeues professe robbery and spoile, whensoeuer their opportunitie may serue: shall he therefore be termed a slanderer of theeues, and *a notable liar?* I know *P. R.* is wittie, and can applie this similitude vnto himselfe, whom it most concerneth:

P. R. his calumniation manifested by a Simile.

cerneth: for he who in this place bringeth in a triple instance of Protestant Princes, *who were admitted peaceably to their Crownes*, insinuating that therefore they were willingly admitted on the Romish part, may be easily confuted by another triple instance taken from himselfe. 1. Of the now K. of France, *who being K. of Nauarre, was resisted, that he should not succeed in the kingdome of France, lest being in that disposition* (meaning a Protestant) *he might haue altred religion in France.* 2. of Q. Elizabeth he hath also sayd, that *she was excommunicate by the Pope*, (by whose Bull she was also pronounced to be no Queene) *because she had changed religion.* Will they not for the same reason hinder succession, for the which they haue endeuoured to disturbe a possession? 3. The third instance is in our dread Souereigne *K. Iames*, P. R. in his *Dolman* hath held against his succession to the Crowne foure arguments of exclusion. Obserue now three singular notes of this mans modestie: 1. He accuseth me to be a slanderer for a touching a report, prooued true by incontroleable consequence, and whereunto no instance of any Priest was or could be obiected. 2. He offereth to satisfie a question of *Right* and iustice with an instance of *fact* and euent, as if he would teach vs to reason thus: Romish Priests do not say Masse publikely in England: Ergo they think it vtterly vnlawful that Masse should be sayd publikly in England. 3. He hath so assoiled the question by a triple instance, that by another triple instance of his own he is more strictly and dangerously intangled. Let me mention, for further discouerie of this his delusion, the *Breue* of *Pope Clemens* the 8. commanding that at the death of *Q. Elizabeth* none should be suffered to succeed, who was not a professed Romish Catholike. This M. *Garnet* confessed at the Barre, which his confession remaineth in publike Record. If any shall require a reason why they resisted not his Maiesties entrance, they can not possibly yeeld any, but only want of meanes of *disturbance*. So that I might confesse my selfe very *shamelesse* indeed, if I should not blush and sorrow in his behalfe, to see any man by so presumptuous falsehoods to murder his owne soule.

See heereafter §. 12. num. 38, and §. 13. num. 39.

A falshood full of dangerous delusion.

» 23 Which is yet more visible by the second part of this accu-
» sation which *P. R.* inferreth thus: ' *What or how far this fellow*
» *may be trusted in these his assertiõs may be gathered by the last sen-*
» *tence of all his discourse in this matter, where he hath these words:*
» [F. Parsons (in his Dolman) doth pronounce sentence, that
» whosoeuer shall cõsent to the succession of a Protestant prince,
» is a most grieuous and damnable sinner.] *And is it so Sir Tho-*
» *mas? And will you stand to it & lose your credit, if this be falsly and*
» *calumniously alleged? then if you please, let vs heare the Authors*
» *owne words, viz. And now (saith Doleman part. 1. pag. 216.)*
» *to apply all this to our purpose for England, and for the matter wee*
» *haue in hand, I affirme and hold that for any man to giue his helpe,*
» *consent or assistance towards the making of a King, whom he iud-*
» *geth or belaeueth to be faulty in religion, and consequently would*
» *aduance either no religion, or the wrong, if he were in authority, is*
» *a most grieuous and damnable sinne to him that doth it, of what*
» *side soeuer the truth be, that is preferred. So he. And his reason*
» *is, for that he should sin against his own conscience in furthering such*
» *a King. And is there heere any word peculiar of a Protestant*
» *Prince, or of his successour? nay doth not the Text speake plainely*
» *of making a King, where none is? doth it not speake also indiffe-*
» *rently of all sorts of religion, of what side soeuer the truth be?*
» *How then can this malitious cauilling Minister expect to bee tru-*
» *sted heereafter, or how may any man thinke that hee speaketh or*
» *writeth out of his conscience, seing him to vse such grosse shifts and*
» *falshoods in so manifest and important a matter? It is no maruell if*
» *he set not his name at large to his booke, as not desirous to haue the*
» *due praise of such desert.*

' Treatis. of *Mitig at.* chap. 2. num. 35. pag. 72. The obiected falshood out of the testimonie of *Doleman* answered and confuted.

24 Venture my credit, Sir? yes that I will, though I value nothing to be more pretious among men, and therefore willingly put it into this affirmatiue ballance concerning the sentence of *Doleman*, prouing it true in that sense it hath beene alleged, if you will put yours in the other, which is the negatiue, our Reader shall hold the scales, and the euidence of *Dolemans* booke shall cast it.

The subiect of our question is, whether *Doleman*, one of the three Romish Priests, doth account it a *damnable sinne* in his

his Catholikes to suffer a Protestant Prince to succeed in the Crown: after I had proued this to be the Romish doctrine by the testimony of three Priests, I added this fourth, which was *Doleman*. Wherefore wee must examine whether this bee the iudgement of *Doleman* or no. It belongeth to mee to prooue the affirmatiue, to wit, that this was the iudgement of *Doleman*.

25 The title of that booke is, *A conference about the next succession to the Crowne of England* (namely, next after the death of Q. Elizabeth) *and about all such as may pretend* a right, *whether within England or without*. One of the contents of the first Chapter is, that *Neerenesse of blood may upon iust causes be altered*. And of the sixt Chapter: that, *An heire apparent to the crowne before he be crowned may be iustly put backe*. After this he proceedeth to expresse his iust causes, the principall hee deliuereth in the ninth chapter, the very place now alleged: The Contents is this, *That one principall cause of excluding any Prince is diuersitie of Religion*. Whereof he resolueth thus: [a] *Nothing can more iustly exclude an heire apparent from his succession, as want of Religion, nor any cause whatsoeuer iustifie the Commonwealth, or conscience of particular men, that in this cause should resist his entrance, than if he find him faulty in this point, which is the head of all the rest*. Where we see, that the person spoke of is *an heire apparent*. By which word cannot be meant a successor by Election, but a successour by naturall descent and right of inheritance. Of this *heire apparent* he [x] saith further; that as when a woman is espoused vnto an husband which is an Infidel, this contract (by the doctrine of the Apostle) may be dissolued: so is the case of an Infidel pretender vnto the Crowne. And lest any may doubt who in this case may be held an Infidel, he addeth that [y] *Seeing there can bee but onely one faith auaileable vnto saluation, certaine it is that vnto my conscience whosoeuer beleeueth otherwise than I doe, and standeth wilfully in the same, is an Infidel, for that he beleeueth not that which in my faith and conscience is the sole saving faith*. This ground thus laid, he commeth at last vnto the application before specified, saying: *And now to apply, &c.* affirming that, *Whosoeuer giueth any*

[a] Doleman. part 1. cap. 9. pag. 212.

[x] Doleman pag. 213.

[y] Ib. pag. 214.

helpe

helpe to the making a King, whom he iudgeth to be faulty in Religion, is a most grieuous and damnable sinner.

26 One Syllogisme will assoile the whole doubt.

Maior. Euery man is a damnable sinner, who admitteth any Prince to succeed in the Crowne, whom hee thinketh faultie in Religion.

Minor. But euery Romish Catholike thinketh all Protestant Princes faulty in Religion.

Ergo, euery Romish Catholike, who admitteth of a Protestant Prince to succeed in the Crowne, is a damnable sinner.

What is there in all this Syllogisme which *Dolemanalias Parsons*, can denie to be his Assertion? The *Maior* hee hath said, *He that admitteth of any to the Crowne, whom he thinketh to be of faulty religion, is a damnable sinner.* Is it the *Minor?* why, he hath said that, *There is but one true Religion.* And *Parsons* being a Romish Priest must intend that all Protestants in the iudgement of all Catholikes are of *a faulty Religion.* Will hee then denie the *Ergo* or *Conclusion?* this were against the Law of Logicke, and then his Sophisters would deride him. How then can my assertion be thought slanderous, which necessary consequence of reason prodoeth to bee too true? As for example, Suppose that this *P. R.* hath promised his Creditour to pay him foure Nobles, at a certaine time appointed, at what time his Creditour challengeth him saying, Sir you are to pay mee twenty six shillings eight pence, according to the words of your owne promise; by and by *P. R.* (purging his choler) answereth, *This is falsly and calumniously* vrged, was there any *such word* of twenty six shillings eight pence in all my promise? Nay did I not expresly say, that I would pay thee foure Nobles? *What a malitious cauilling Creditor art thou, or how shall any thinke thou seekest thy debts with good conscience, seeing thou vsest these shifts and falshoods* in a summe of this *importance?* Would not by-standers either laugh at him, as at a lunatike, or else suspect him for a cosening cheater? because he that promiseth foure Nobles, promiseth twenty six shillings eight pence, though not in the same literall words, yet in the reall

The idle and ridiculous calumniation of *P. R.* discouered by two Similies.

reall ſenſe. Or elſe more pertinently thus: Let vs ſuppoſe this to be a generall doctrine amongſt his Catholikes, that *no perſon* borne without England can be accounted lawfull heire to that kingdome: which [1] *Doleman* inſinuateth by his particular obſeruation of the ſame *Maxime* againſt the ſucceſſion of our dread ſoueraigne, then the only king of *Scotland*, and that ſome thus libelling were taken, and by ſome Proteſtant accuſed of treaſon, for affirming that *K. Iames* had no right to the Crown of England: the libeller ſhould anſwer ſaying: This accuſation is falſe and ſlanderous, I named not *K. Iames*, but only ſaid in generall (though particularly I intended *K. Iames*) that *none* borne without *England* was a iuſt ſucceſſor to the crown: the Iudge ſhould ſay, well then thine owne mouth hath condemned thee, inaſmuch as if thou ſhouldeſt now ſay that there is no king in England, (although none be named) becauſe the right one, who is *K. Iames*, is diſabled, when euery one is excluded. It is true, (ſaith the libeller) by iuſt conſequence, but yet I named none. Would *P. R.* if he heard this, pronounce this fellow vnguiltie? then is he no *Mitigator*: would he iuſtifie his accuſer? then am I no liar. For the caſe is alike, eſpecially knowing that the ſcope of that whole booke, called *Doleman*, and penned by *Parſons* a Prieſt, is only this, to diſable the titles of all Proteſtants (yea euen *K. Iames* by name) and to debarre them all hope of ſucceſſion in *Great Britaine*: and to preferre the *Infanta* of *Spaine* before all other pretenders. This then hath beene but his cauilling malice thus iniuriouſly to accuſe me of *malitious cauilling*. There remaineth only

[1] Doleman *part. 2. cap. 5. pag. 116.*

See a further anſwer hereafter in this Preamble.

An Argument of P. R. his kind of truth, full of triumphant treachery.

§ 8.

27 THough all the former Arguments of *P. R.* his wit, memory, learning, and modeſty containe in them the liuely characters and demonſtrations of a liar, yet haue I reſerued to this laſt place of truth, ſuch an accuſation, from whence

[1] Treatise of *Mitigat.* cap. 6. num. 36. pag. 215.

„ one would thinke he had gained a triumph saying: [1] *In the ve-*
„ *ry next page* (saith P. R.) *after, he talking of the great and famous*
„ *contention that passed betweene Pope* Gregory *the seuenth, called*
„ Hildebrand, *and* Henry *the fourth Emperor of that name, about*
„ *the yeere* 1070. *he citeth the Historiographer* Otto Frisingensis,
„ *with this ordinary title of* Out Otto, *for that hee writeth that hee*
„ *found not any Emperour actually excommunicated or deprived of*
„ *his kingdome by any Pope before that time, except* (*saith he*) *that*
„ *may be esteemed for an Excommunication which was done to* Phi-
„ lip *the Emperour by the Bishop of Rome, almost* 1400. *yeeres a-*
„ *gone, when for a short time hee was* inter poenitentes collocatus,
„ *placed by the said Pope amongst those that did penance; as that*
„ *also of the Emperour* Theodosius, *who was sequestred from en-*
„ *tring into the Church by* S. Ambrose, *for that hee had comman-*
„ *ded a certaine cruell slaughter to be committed in the city of* Thes-
„ salonica: *both which exceptions this Minister of* simple truth
„ *leaueth out of purpose, which is no simplicity, as you see, but yet no*
„ *great matter with him, in respect of the other that ensueth, which is,*
[*] Frisin. l. 6. hist. c. 32. „ *that he alleged this* * Frisingensis *quite contrary to his own mea-*
„ *ning, as though hee had condemned Pope* Gregory *the seuenth for*
„ *it, whereas he condemneth that cause of the Emperour, and com-*
„ *mẽdeth highly the Pope for his constancy in punishing the notorious*
„ *faults of the said* Henry. Hildebrandus (*saith he*) semper in
„ Ecclesiastico rigore constantissimus fuit: *Hildebrand was euer*
„ *the most constant in defending the rigour of Ecclesiasticall Disci-*
„ *pline.* And againe in this very Chapter alleged by T. M. Inter
„ omnes Sacerdotes & Romanos Pontifices praecipui zeli & au-
„ thoritatis fuit: *Hee was among all the Priests and Popes that had*
„ *beene of the Roman Sea of most principall zeale and authority.*
„ *How different is this iudgement of* Frisingensis *from the censure*
„ *of* T. M. *who now after* 500. *yeeres past compareth the cause of*
„ *Pope* Gregory *to that of pyrates, theeues and murtherers, and so*
„ *citeth our* Otto Frisingensis, *as though hee had fauoured him in*
„ *this impious assertion? Can any thing bee more fraudulently alle-*
„ *ged? is this the assurance of his vpright conscience whereof hee*
„ *braggeth to his Maiesty?*

28 In the *Full Satisfaction* Part. 3. Cha. 11. Pa. 28. that which

was

was intended to be proued was this: That not till a thousand yeeres after Christ did euer any Prelate or Pope attempt the deposing of Emperors and depriuing them of their Crownes. For proofe heereof I brought in the testimony of *Otto Frisingensis* from the witnesse of *Tolossanus lib. 26. De Repub. cap. 5.* in these words, *I reade and reade againe, and finde, That Pope Hildebrand, in the yeere 1060. was the first Pope, who euer depriued an Emperor of his regiment.* Wherein now haue I wronged my conscience? Is it *because Otto Frisingensis is cited contrarie to his meaning?* If this should be supposed to be true, yet could it not preiudice my conscience, because I cited not the Author himselfe, but only *Tolossanus* a Romish Doctor, who reported that sentence of *Frisingensis*. And is not this a fine treacherie of my Accuser to conceale the Authour, and so eagerly and bitterly to inueigh against me, who am only the Relater, and might answer him, That if I be deceiued your owne Doctor hath deceiued me? This answer I vse heere to demonstrate the malice of my Accuser, and not (although it might suffice) to satisfie the point in question, in behalfe whereof I auouch my Allegation to be true. And why not? *Otto Frisingensis* (sayth *P. R.*) *mentioneth ancient examples of two Emperors, who were excommunicate, both which the Minister of simple truth leaueth out of purpose.* I left them out of purpose (I confesse) otherwise I should haue beene like to your selfe in this and other such cauilles, who desire to say much, though nothing to the purpose. For to what purpose, I pray you, had this beene, seeing our question was not to shew what Emperors had beene excommunicated, but who, being excommunicate, had been deposed from their Royalties? Then my case is no otherwise, than supposing that *P. R.* or any other had beene degraded in any Vniuersitie, and demand being made concerning the time, when this was done: I should answer (and that truly) that it was in the dayes of Elizabeth Queene of England: presently *P. R.* after his ordinary maner of saluation should call me Liar, because I ought to haue told that he was admonished and excommuned before he was degraded. So dull and friuolous is his present taxation in a question

A trecherous falshood.

A dull taxation, as the simile sheweth.

stion of Antiquity, concerning the time when first any Pope did take vpon him to depose Emperours. *Frisingensis* sayth plainly, that *Hildebrand was the first*: he saith moreouer (commending him) that *Hildebrand was constant in punishing faults*. Say then (good *P. R.*) seeing both these two are true, can one of them be a lie? As if when two noble men *H.* and *B.* contend whether of them are of more ancient descent, I should heare *F.* an Herald say, that the house of *B.* is not so ancient by much: yet is *B.* (saith the Herald) in his owne person both in regard of valure and bountie farre more honorable than *H.* Then I, purposing to answer to the question, report the Heralds speech: to wit: *The house of B. is not, by much, so ancient as is the house of H.* Would *P. R.* hearing this, presently crie out, *ô notorious and intolerable liar!* sayd the Herald so? did he not commend *B.* for *valour* and *bountie?* Could any by-stander containe laughter, to heare such a senslesse exception as this? becaus that although I omitted the commendation of bountie, yet did I truly relate the obseruation of Ancientrie, which was the principall matter in question. I leaue the application vnto *P. R.* let *H.* be *Henrie* the Emperor, *B.* the Bishop of Rome, *F.* the Herald, *Frisingensis*, &c. But *P. R.* is iealous of his Fathers honor, and therfore will haue it knowen that he is *commended by Frisingensis*, and yet could not be ignorant, that the next witnesse, whom I [a] produced, *Claudius Espencæus*, their owne Romish Bishop, doth plainly auerre, that *Hildebrand was the first Pope, who without any example of antiquitie made a schisme betweene Emperours and Popes, and by his example prouoked the Popes following him, to take armes against Kings excommunicate*. This Author disabling not only the antiquitie of that rebellious practise of the Pope, but also condemning the fact it selfe. Therefore hath *P. R.* by wily silence made as it were a pocketting of this Author, as of a medlar. And was not this a piece of fine fraud?

A Simile.

[a] *Full Satisf.* part. 3. chap. 11. pag. 28.

A falshood in concealment.

29 But *P. R.* is not contented to haue noted me in the former (as he calleth it) *notorious fault*, but repeateth it againe, making himselfe therein in a maner triumphant, saying, that

[b] Treatise „ [b] *Otto Frisingensis commendeth Hildebrand, and yet is brought*

in

in to condemne him. After this againe he insulteth vpon it in this sort: *Truly, if any man can shew me out of all the Catholike writers that be extant, English or other, that euer any one of them vsed this shamefull fraud in writing, where no excuse can free them from malicious and witting falshood, then will I grant that this is not proper to the Protestant spirit alone. Hitherto, I must confesse, that I neuer found it in any, and if I should, though it were but once, I should holde it for a sufficient argument not to beleeue him euer after. And this shall suffice for a taste only of M. Mortons maner of proceeding. For that to prosecute all particulars would require a whole volume, and by these few you may ghesse at the mans veine and spirit in writing.* So *P. R.* of *Mitigat.* chap 6. nū. 39. pa. 217.

Mark how hainous he maketh his accusation.

30 Aristotle telleth vs of one *Antiphon*, who was of that weake sight, that whensoeuer he walked he saw his owne image reflecting vpon him in the aire. What shall we imagine of this exclamation against *shamefull and malicious fraud in writing*, except it had beene spoken in respect of the reflection of his owne image, who hath playd me foure malicious tricks in one page? One is, To lay an imputation of falshood vpon me, as though I had cunningly pretermitted the examples of Emperors excommunicate, whereas the question was only concerning Emperors depriued of their state and dignities. The second cauill is, Not acknowledging the commendation of *Hildebrand* in *Otto Frisingensis*, when as I intended not to proue out of this Author the equitie, but only the antiquitie of that practise. Thirdly, In making me so perniciously enuious, as to condemne *Hildebrand* without a witnesse, when as I produced their owne Bishop *Espencæus* to condemne him. Lastly, In charging me with a wilfull peruerting of the meaning of the Authour *Otto Frisingensis*, when as (if it had been so abused) yet not I but their owne Doctor *Tolossanus* was the Author of that report.

Foure excellent tricks of falshood in one.

31 The view of all these and other formerly mentioned wilfull and transparent falsities of *P. R.* together with some other the like desperate calumniations to be pointed at in this Preamble, causeth me iustly to present him with his owne image, professing vnfainedly, that I neuer found any Writer of any

profession whatsoeuer, who hath vsed such shamefull fraud in answering. And this, I doubt not, but the Christian Reader will confesse, when he shall see this transfigured Parson appeare in his owne likenesse.

THE SECOND INQVIRIE.

Whether P. R. may be iudged a competent Aduocate for this cause which he hath assumed: and whether *he hath not beene excepted against by his owne fellow.*

§ 9.

32 THis P. R. hath bestowed six or seuen sections in censuring me and my Aduersary the *Moderate Answerer*, concerning whom he writeth thus: [a] ‘ *I must needs say that the Answerer hath endeauoured to effectuate so much as he promised in the title of his book, which was, of* A iust and moderat Answer, *& in performance thereof hath not only borne on matters temperatly, as before hath beene shewed, but spared also his Aduersary in many points, and namely in passing ouer his allegations without note, or checke. ---- In the rest the Answerer quitteth himselfe learnedly, and sheweth much reading in particular, as by the multiplicity of Authors by him alleged doth well appeare.*

[a] Treatise of Mitig. chap. 3. pag. 101.

33 Say you so *P. R.*? Did your fellow answer *Learnedly*? Why who are you, and where is your abode, tell me? [d] *The Booke of* Tho. Morton *was sent me out of England.* Then belike this *Mitigator* is out of *England*, who, by the constant and generall voice, hath his residence at *Rome*. May it now please him to heare what this *Moderate Answerer* (whom he so greatly commended) hath iudged of such extrauagant persons as hee is, if peraduenture any such write bookes concerning our English State? That answerer being pressed with the testimonies of many former Iesuites and others, who defended the first ground of all rebellious positions and practises, was driuen for a *Moderation*, to vse this euasion; [e] ‘ *I suppose*, (saith he) *that*

[d] Treatise of Mitig. chap. 3. pag. 92. num. 3.

[e] The Moder. Answ. chap. 2. §. wherefore to purge, &c.

no

no learned Catholike within this kingdome (yet such as best iudge of this country cause) doth defend this opinion. Hereby censuring all Priests without the kingdome lesse fit or sufficient to meddle in this cause. We see that this *Mitigator* hath commended the *Moderator* for a *learned Answerer*, and that *Moderator* by this his generall censure, hath taken exception vnto this *Mitigator*, concluding him to be an Answerer (in his opinion) insufficient.

34 If both these should meet vpon one stage to act their dispositions, they could not but make good sport for the beholders. As for example (for I will faine nothing in their names, which shal not be consonant & agreeable to their conditions.) First then the *Moderate Answerer* might haue said, *P. R.* you haue beene altogether presumptuous to take vpon you this Answer called the *Mitigation*, knowing that you shall but bewray your ignorance, because residing *out of England*, you cannot be rightly experienced *In this our Countrey cause.* To whom the *Mitigator* might reioine, saying; Nay I haue not beene arrogant, but thou hast beene rash and precipitant, for if thou by thy former answer mightest haue been thought sufficient for a Replie, what needed such posting to mee *beyond the seas* for a supplie of a more exact and learned Reioinder? Then the *Mod. Answerer*; Haue patience, I pray you, For when I perceiued so many of our Authors obiected, al of them by due consequent giuing Protestants cause of hatred against vs, as against those that had by our doctrine decreed a depriuing them of their debts, goods, crownes and liues, whensoeuer opportunity might serue, I was enforced to vse this answer for a refuge, taking exceptions to all Authors out of England, who writ of this English case: and to appeale rather to other Catholikes, who being in this kingdome, haue written nothing heereof. This is the ground of my *Moderation*, which not the truth of our cause, but the necessity of the time did exact at my hands. Whereunto the *Mitigator* thus: Thou hast done well, and such hath beene the cause of my commendation of thy *Answer*, as thou maist perceiue, for I haue said that *I must needs say that the Answerer hath acquitted himself learnedly.*

Craft in Tides of books.

[f] *Mitig. supra.*

nedly. Not that I could thinke so, but because (thou knowest) we must commend and iustifie one another, especially in these times, wherein our malice and madnesse both in doctrine and practise hath been so fully discouered. And therfore I thought it necessary also to intitle my Booke a *Mitigation*, concealing in my mind this reseruation [*To delude my Reader.*] Thus it must be, when we raise a flame of rebellion, which shall not succeed, then it is policy to cast about vs some holy-water sprinkle of plausible termes *Moderation* and *Mitigation*, as though we intended to quench that with our water, which we had rather do with oile. The *Moder*. I perceiue you are subtile and therfore willingly yeeld you place to answer my Aduersary, the rather because I thinke you are troubled with the disease of some of our Catholike Lawyers, of whom you haue sayd, [8] *They itch to be doing*, and answering M. Atturney. This was also my disease, but I after found a scratch, and so may you. Then *Mitig*. Tush, wee need not care, nameless are blameless, for thou settest no name vnto thy *Moderation*, and I only set downe mute and dumbe characters, which are as good as nothing, to my *Mitigation*. Againe, we haue many great and principall oddes of Protestants, besides railing, viz. When our Aduersary prooueth any thing by many testimonies out of our owne Authours, and we are not able to satisfie the common opinion obiected against vs, then to single out any allegation of any one of his witnesses, which hee hath produced, and if thou perceiue him to faile in the manner of alleging, squeeze euery such answer to make him, at the least, seeme to be fraudulent: And if thou canst finde him faulty in one, it is no matter though all the rest of our Authors cited against vs be neuer so true, we shall wound the cause in his person, as he doth our persons in the cause. Furthermore bee alwaies echoing out against him some opprobrious termes, as *Mountbanck*, *Grashopper*, *Malicious*, *shameless*, *false*, and what not? The *Moderat*. I remember I haue often charged him with slanders when as not hee but my selfe did falsifie; which he hath discouered, and in a manner silenced me. The *Mitig*. We need not feare any such euent, because of our manifold

8 Treatis. *Mitig*. preface to the Reader num. 10. P. R. his disease in so oft writing.

Railing.

nifold aduantages: For Proteſtants are licenced to reade any bookes, and ſome in curioſitie, as *Eue*, ſome in doubtfulneſſe, as the *Capernaitans*; many in preſumption, as *Balaam*, moſt for the delight which they finde in an eloquent and inuectory ſtyle of writing (ô mine is excellent!) as *Athenians*; So that it cannot be but where ſo many mice be ſtill nibbling at the baite, ſome will daily be catched. But our Profeſſors be kept ſecure vnder the locke and key of the *vowe of obedience*, or els haue their hearts ſo ſtupified with that *Opium* of implicit faith and blinde deuotion: that though my aduerſarie in his Anſwer ſhall proóue me neuer ſo monſtrouſly calumnious and ſlanderous, yet of our Catholikes few can, and none dare examine or beleeue any thing againſt a Prieſt: this is our ſufficiency. The *Moder.* You haue forgot an other policy we vſe, which is, though our Aduerſary write neuer ſo methodically and orderly, yet not to follow him exactly in his courſe, and commonly to pretermit thoſe authorities which he bringeth, and wherein is the chiefe ſtrength of his cauſe. *Mitigat.* And is not this good policie? he that will cunningly put away a counterfeit piece of coine in ſtead of currant, muſt do it apart from the other money, for if true and counterfeit be compared together, the good will diſcouer the bad, and his booke thou knoweſt is *A Diſcouerie.* Againe, thou maieſt perceaue that when I vſe no method my ſelfe, I challenge him for [b] *want of method.* But why doe we ſpend time in talke, let vs about our buſineſſe. I will be writing a *Mitigation* for ſecuritie of our Catholikes in England, whileſt our fellowes are practizing rebellion in [i] *Ireland* for the ſubuerſion of Proteſtants. Thus, thus it muſt be. Farewell. In all this there is no more

The aduantages the Romiſh faction hath.

[b] *Mitig.* pag. 113. cap. 4. §. 2. num. 15.

[i] See the late Proclamation.

repreſented then is too certainly acted by the Romaniſts, as in our *Incounter* vnto *P. R.* will more plentifully appeare. It is time we come vnto

THE THIRD INQVIRIE:

To examine how sufficiently P. R. *hath performed his* challenge as well for the equitie of his cause, as for the *integritie of his conscience: His cause, both as* it is premised in the title of his booke, *and as it is discussed in the Treatise.*

Of these summarily and in order.

FIRST.

That the title of the Booke of P. R. *called* A Mitigation, is very ominous and vnluckie to them, whom *especially he labours to defend.*

§ 10.

35 THe subiect of his whole *Mitigation* is by *P. R.* thus propounded in the Title of his booke, viz. *That it is not impossible for Subiects of different Religion (especially Catholikes and Protestants) to liue together in dutifull obedience and subiection vnder the gouernment of his Maiestie of Great Britaine.*

It is not *impossible*, good: For why? It is not impossible for [k] *fire* to descend from heauen, and the [l] people of God to passe safely thorow the Red sea; It is not impossible for [m] *Asse* to speake reason, and the [n] *Diuell* to tell truth: It is not impossible for the [o] *dead* to be raised to life, and for the *Disciples* of our Sauiour *by* [p] *faith to remoue mountaines*. Nothing is impossible with God; who as hee prescribeth the raging Sea his bounds, which it can not passe, though naturally it affect an ouerflow and deluge of the whole world; so doth hee by his gracious prouidence often represse the furie of rebellious spirits in what profession soeuer; and, notwithstanding they trauell with mischiefe, yet he keepeth them in an awfull subiection.

[k] 2. Reg. 1. 10
[l] Exod. 14. 22.
[m] Num. 22. ver. 28. 29. 30.
[n] Matth. 8 29. & alibi.
[o] Ioh. 11. Matt. 9. &c.
[p] Matt. 21. 21. Marc. 11. 23. &c.

iection. And shall now this *Mitigation* of feares, conceiued by Protestants against the bloody designments of their Romish Aduersaries, consist of no better termes then the *possibilitie* of things, which are in the ordinarie course of nature *impossible*? Though a man taken vpon suspicion of felonie be charged by his accuser to be most certainly the man, who assaulted him by the way, might not be thought to satisfie the Iustice, saying, Sir hee chargeth mee that it was impossible but that I must haue done this mischiefe; Neuertheless I shall proue the contrarie, to wit, that it was not impossible, but an other might haue done it, and not I. Although this Answer might confute his accuser, who said, *It is impossible but that it was you*, yet could it not satisfie the Iustice, because still the answer implieth as well a possibilitie that he did it, as an impossibilitie that he did it not. Hath not therefore *P. R.* their learned Aduocate merited of his Clients, a Catholike, thas is, an vniuersall fee, who now intending a *Mitigation* of their punishment, hath giuen the State so great cause of suspecting their disloyaltie, as that he dare promise no better assurance in their behalfe, then only, *It is not impossible for them to liue in obedience?* S. Pauls charge concerning temporall obedience is, [q] *Let euery soule be subiect to the higher powers*; And againe, [r] *We must be subiect not because of wrath onely, but also for conscience sake*. Wherein he hath prescribed vs not a *may* but a *must*; and thereby inioyned not a *possibilitie*, but a *necessitie* of loyall subiection. But this [*It is not impossible to liue in obedience*] is no more by Logicall conuersion then this; *It is possible to liue in obedience*. Which so suspicious and imposturous a Title of his whole booke can minister no more hope to Protestants of his pretended *Mitigation* and composition, then an adulterous woman can satisfie her husband, and *mitigate* his iealousie by this maner of submission: Be contented, good husband, though I haue committed folly as often as I had presumption of secrecie and opportunitie to satisfie my lust; yet now may you bee better perswaded of me, for I protest vnto you, it is not impossible that I shal liue honestly hereafter. This case is nothing different from the former. What shall we then

P.R. a miserable Aduocate for his Catholikes.

q Rom. 13. 1.

r vers. 5.

Simile.

thinke of *P. R.* but as of the man, who had purposed with himselfe either to scorne Protestants, or else to betray his Catholikes? Neuertheless as worldly feasters vsually offer their guests [f] *The best wine first, and then that which is worse*: So he hath prefixed in the forehead of his booke this Title of *Mitigation*, although prodigious and intolerable (as we haue heard) yet more plausible than the whole Tract of the booke it selfe, which teacheth indeed an *impossibilitie* of all voluntarie subiection vnto Protestant Princes; insomuch that after but a summarie view hereof, it will appeare that the title of his booke and his Treatise are no more proportionable and agreeable, than the head of an Ape ioyned with the bodie of a Beare. From the Title we proceed vnto the Treatise, and manifest

[f] Ioh. 2.10.

That the Mitigator *in his* Treatise *hath betrayed his* whole cause both in the question of *Rebellion*, and *Aequiuocation*.

---

§ I. I.

36 WHen the Apostle *S. Iude* in his *Catholike Epistle*, speaking of men opposite vnto the soundnesse of faith, exhorteth Christians to [t] *Haue a compassion on some in putting a difference, And others to saue with feare, pulling them out of the fire*: he teacheth vs likewise a lesson of great discretion, which is, to distinguish betweene men who are aduerse vnto vs in Religion. So now I write against our Aduersaries, but not without note of difference and distinction, being verily perswaded that diuers euen of the zealous amongst them, partly by the power of the *ingraffed* law of reason, partly from a glimpse of the truth of the Gospel, do abhor such doctrines and practises, as haue beene *discouered* in the cases of *Rebellion* & *Æquiuocation*. So that my only aime hath alwayes been at those, who are so inspired with the perswasion of their Priests, as to beleeue their doctrine in both these specified Articles. Concerning whose pretended voluntarie obedience, I shall

[t] Vers. 22.

A difference of Romish professours concerning the case of rebellion.

proue

proue to bee in a maner, a confeſſed *impoſſibility* of *dutifull ſubiection* vnto Proteſtant Princes; and conſequently as ſenſible an oppoſition as was betweene *Iewes* and *Iebuſites* in one kingdome, *Iſaac* and *Iſmael* in one houſe, *Iacob* and *Eſau* in one wombe: as by this Treatiſe of *P. R.* will directly appeare.

The First confeſſed Impoſſibility.

37 We firſt demand what Soueraigntie our *Mitigator* will allow his Maieſty of *Great Britaine*: and whether there may be any forren Potentate, whom he would aduance aboue him in reſpect of his temporall charge? *P. R.* reſolueth thus: "*Whether with this Commiſſion in ſpirituall affaires our Sauior gaue alſo immediately and directly, the charge and ouerſight of temporalities in like manner, or rather indirectly and by a certaine conſequence, that is to ſay, that when the gouernment of ſpirituall affaires, to wit, of ſoules to their eternall bliſſe and ſaluation is ſo letted and impugned by any temporall gouernours, as the ſaid ſpirituall Commiſſion cannot be executed without redreſſe or remedy, in ſuch caſes, and not otherwiſe, the ſaid ſupreame Paſtor to haue authority to proceed alſo againſt the ſaid temporall gouernors, for defence and preſeruation of his ſpirituall charge. Of which queſtion the Canoniſts do commonly defend the firſt part, but Catholike Diuines for the moſt part the ſecond: but both parts full agree, that there is ſuch an authority left by Chriſt in his Church, for remedy of vrgent caſes.* Thus farre *P. R.* See then that by this arguing hee ſeeketh to eſtabliſh a Papall *power* and *ouer-ſight* euen in *Temporall affaires*, whether *directly* or *indirectly* it skilleth not, ſeeing (that in his opinion) *both do agree*: But the oath of Allegeance with Proteſtants is otherwiſe: namely, that *No forren perſon or Potentate hath any* ſuch *ſupremacy in Great Britaine*. Therefore the *Mitigation* of *P. R.* ſtandeth of no more poſſibility, than Pope and no Pope, Kings ſupremacy and not ſupremacy. Which oppoſites can neuer be reconciled together.

" *P. R.* Treat. in the Preface pag. 24. num. 22. which he applieth to the Pope, pag. 70.

Romiſh doctrine againſt the oath of due allegeance vnto Proteſtant Princes.

The Second confeſſed Impoſſibility.

38 Secondly, becauſe hee hath told vs, that there is a *Power*

ordained against Kings in *temporall affaires*, it may concerne vs to vnderstand the first extent thereof, whether against the goods, or persons, or liues of such Princes as shall resist the spirituall iurisdiction of Popes? Hee doth deliuer his meaning in two examples: [z] *Two Protestant Princes were excommunicated,* „ *censured, molested by the Sea Apostolike, Q. Elizabeth of Eng-* „ *land, and K. Henry then of Nauar, now of France: the first of these* „ *two for the violent change of Religion which she made in the Realm* „ *with depriuations and imprisonments of Catholike Bishops, Pre-* „ *lates, and Clergie, &c. The other for feare hee comming to the* „ *Crowne of France in that disposition, wherein hee then was presu-* „ *med to be, should attempt the like change in that great Kingdome,* „ *&c.* These examples are both plaine and pregnant, a Protestant Queene must be depriued for resisting the spirituall iurisdiction of the Pope, and a Protestant King also must be deposed, lest peraduenture he may make any resistance. Now wee see that the same Papall authority is by the lawes of Great Britaine as expressly excluded, their Religion suppressed, their Clergy exiled, and Protestants religion (according to former proceedings) continued. All which doth argue as great an *impossibility of dutifull subiection*, as it is for *hinderance* and sufferance, *change* and continuance of the same Religion to be matched and married together. And could our *Mitigator* shew himselfe a more egregious Preuaricator than thus?

[z] P. R. Trea. cap. 2. pag. 77. num. 42. Romish doctrine derogatory to the Crowne and dignity of Protestant Princes.

The Third confessed Impossibility.

39 Because *P. R.* hath told vs that Protestant Princes *haue beene molested by the Pope*, it will be materiall to inquire what this word *Molestation* may meane: For a man would thinke it some qualifying terme, and to import no greater iniuries than either reuiling the names of Kings, or disgracing their Embassadours, or damnifying their Merchants, or such like wrongs. Tush no, for all such like contempts are contemptible, and may easily be deuoured, but this *molestation* (according to the discouered *positions* and *practises* of *rebellion*, whereunto this *Mitigator* neither hath or could take any exception) is, [y] *Because the Queene of England hath forbid her Clergie and people to ac-*

[y] The Bull of Pope *Pius Quintus*. See the *Satisfact. part.* 1. *pag.* 51.

knowledge the Romane Church, or obey her decrees, &c. And because we vnderstand her to bee so obstinate, as not to suffer our Legates to come into England, &c. We therefore pronounce her heretical, anathematizing her and all her adherents, and furthermore deprive her of her Crowne and dignity, absoluing all her subiects from the oath of allegeance. So likewise of the K. of France, [a] *Pronouncing him to be deprived of his Regall dignity: Because he is a Caluinist.* Vpon this followed the *Spanish Invasion*, the Rebellions in *Ireland*, the troubles in *France*, none without an effected or intended horrible and tragicall blood-shed. All these with *P. R.* are but *Molestations*. So the powder-treason, an immanity barbarous and matchlesse, which he calleth but [b] *A particular temerarious fact of halfe a score yong Gentlemen, put in despaire by apprehension of publike persecution, without demerit of the persecuted, though this also be inexcusable.* By which his so tender touch of so cankred and desperate euils, wee may well thinke that *Nabal* by his foolerie neuer deserued better to be so called, than this booke hath merited in this only respect, the name of *Mitigation*: being indeed nothing but an hatching of a Cockatrices egge, and a close professing of subuerting all Protestant Princes, whensoeuer they shall seeke the like publike maintenance of Religion. This *Mitigation* therfore as yet affoordeth vs no more *possibility* of their voluntary obedience, than to hope that reuerence and violence, *Subiection* and *Rebellion*, pole arctique and antarctique, may be drawne into vnion. And because this is so plaine, that blindnesse it selfe may seeme to behold it, therefore doth *P. R.* cast his Reader into a sleepe with a dos of his *Opium*. Let vs see

The Fourth Impossibility, wherein may bee obserued,
A sportfull or rather execrable Impo-
sturaship of P. R.

40 Lest Protestants might, from experience of former dangers arme themselues against future designements, *P. R.* thought good by [c] *Preoccupation* to possesse his Reader with better hopes, saying: [c] *That wee do ascribe power to the Bishop of Rome in certaine cases to censure, excommunicate, and deprive Princes,*

[a] *Lib. de iusta abdicat. Hen. pag. 370.*

[a] *Reinolds his Rossens, pag. 466. See Satisfact. part. 1. pag. 58. & 40.* Romish doctrine bloodily treasonable in the Protestant gouernment.

[b] *P. R. Treatis. cap. 1. pag. 50. num. 27.*

[c] *P. R. Treatis. of Mitig. cap. 2. pag. 95. num. 8.*

" *Princes, whereof is inferred that such & such dangers do ensue: which*
" *finally is nothing else but a* [*May:*] *So as the question being* de fu-
" turis contingentibus, *of things contingent to come (whereof the*
" *Philosopher saith there is no science) all remaineth in vncertainty,*
" *but only the suspition and hatred, which he would raise against vs.*

I cannot laugh for wonder and horror to see any Englishman conceit so basely of the wits and woorth of his Countrey-men, as to imagine they could bee deluded with so senseleſſe, so shameleſſe, so pernicious, so impious a *Mitigation* as this is. For, to bee perswaded therefore not to labour for preuenting *Insuing dangers, because they be contingent*, that is, *such as may happen*, what can be more senseleſſe? For *Science* properly taken is a certaine knowledge of conclusions, arising from infallible demonstrations, as this conclusion, The number of 3. is a leſſe number than 9. from this demonstration, *Euery part is leſſe than the whole.* And so is the opinion of *P. R.* good; *There is no science of things contingent*, because science standeth vpon demonstrable principles. But Science in a more common and large sense is exercised vpon τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον, that is, euery thing which is subiect to mans will: whereupon it is that Physitians prescribe diets to preuent future diseases; passengers prouide weapons to defend them from future violence; kingdomes prouide lawes and officers to auoid future mischiefes: Nay what is there almost in mankind, considered in it selfe, but case of *contingency*? So that all are actions of prouidence directed for the preuenting of future euils and dangers which may happen. And is not this then a stupifying receipt, which *P. R.* hath propounded, casting the State into a slumber, of not regarding *Insuing dangers, because they may be heereafter*? Doth not nature in beast, reason in man, precept of God teach vs the contrary law of prouidence, euen therefore to seeke to preuent *Insuing dangers, because they are contingent, and may bee heereafter*?

41 It is also most shameleſſe, for [d] *Henry K. of France* (saith P. R.) *was excommunicated, censured and* [illegible]*lested, least he should attempt the change of Religion in his kingdom.* And againe (speaking of the necessity of Papall Iurisdiction ouer Kings) hee saith

[d] P. R. Treatis. cap. 2. pag. 77. num. 42. P. R. contradicteth himself.

saith that [a] *If Christ had not left such a remedy to his Church, he should not haue prouided for the necessity thereof.* Concluding that therefore Popes may impugne temporall Gouernours. Heere we see hee challengeth a necessary prouidence in the Popes against Kings, who happily *may* (*de futuris contingentibus*) abuse their authority. And shall Kings therefore neglect their States, because Popes by Antichristian vsurpation (*de futuris contingentibus*) *may* seeke to subuert and ruinate their kingdomes, and so make themselues to their enemies no better than a matter of a *May*-game?

[a] Preface to the Reader *pag.* 25. *num.* 22.

42 I haue also called this *Mitigation* pernicious. For our Aduersaries haue taught that [f] *Kings must not be suffered to raigne, when they draw their Subiects vnto heresie.* But, [g] *Must bee rooted out.* [h] *Which must bee done by all meanes possible.* Whether it be as [i] *Iehu* did *Iezabel*; or as [k] *Dauid* did *Goliah*; or as [l] *Iudith did Holofernes*; or as [m] *A shepheard doth a Wolfe, &c.* [n] *And not Kings only, but all the fauourers of heretikes, by what name so euer they be called, must be destroied.* All these their cursed resolutions *P. R.* passeth in silence. In all which we heare prescribed a *must* for necessary destruction of Kings, and yet this *Mitigator* will allow but only a *may* for their preseruation. This is fine *May*-butter which hee hath mixed in this receipt, or rather deceipt of *Mitigation*: made thus pleasant and palitable only that the too credulous patient *may* bee more sweetly poisoned, especially knowing that all his fellows haue professed all violence, [o] *As soone as they shall haue force to resist.* Therefore this *Mitigation* is but as if *P. R.* would haue thus counselled our English State in the last danger, saying; Trouble not your thoughts (ô King) with diuination vpon that letter, for peraduenture that *Terrible blow* doth signifie nothing else than that there *may* bee a blowing vp of the Parliament with fire. And you Officers of his Maiesty what need you to vse such diligent search vnder the vault, where you see nothing but billets, vnder which it *may* be there is hidden many barrels of powder. Yea and now againe, though the like (if yet the forge of hell can deuise the like) may be prepared hereafter, *Yet what necessity is there of preuenting insuing dangers?*

[f] *Bellar.* See *Satisfact. part.* 1. *pag.* 56.
[g] *Sanders, Creswell*, in the same place.
[h] *Sanders ib. pag.* 67.
[i] *Bowchier.*
[k] *Parsons.*
[l] *Reinolds.*
[m] *Bellar.* See all these *Satisfact. part.* 1. *pag.* 56. & 57.
[n] The Bull of Pope *Vrbane* against Protestants in *Germanie.* See *Satisfact. pag.* 9 and *Sander. pag.* 67.
[o] *Bannes, Creswel, lib. de Iust. Abdicat. Bellar.* See *Satisf. part.* 1. *cap.* 24.
P. R. would flout and delude the State of England.

What is this elſe than to ſeeke to catch our State, as a man would do an horſe, offering bread in the one hand, and holding an halter in the other behind him? *Dutifull ſubiection* in the Preface, and lurking treaſon in the Treatiſe. In a word the impoſſibility of this *Mitigation* is no leſſe than to thinke that murderers and murdered can hoaſt well together.

43 Laſtly I call it impious, becauſe this profeſſion of their forbearance of rebellion, vntill they may reſiſt, hath beene prooued by incontrolable teſtimonies of [p] *Tertul. Cypr. Athan. Nazian. Leo, Baſil, Auguſt. Greg.* (beſides the confeſſion of our Aduerſaries, *Toloſſan. Eſpenca. Barclay*) to be contrary to the diſcipline of the ancient Catholike Church for a 1000. yeeres continuance. By all which teſtimonies the now Romiſh faction is ſo notably condemned, that euen *P. R.* thought it the beſt ſecurity of his cauſe to paſſe almoſt euery teſtimony (except one) without any particular examination. As yet therefore we heare them onely pretending that they *may* performe obedience, which they profeſſe they *muſt not*, whenſoeuer they ſhall bee able to make a poſsible reſiſtance. So hopeleſſe is this his pretended *poſſibility of ſubiection.*

[p] See *Satisf. part.* 1. *pag.* 185. *Allen, Parſons, Martin, &c.*

The laſt Impoſſibility in the practiſe of Æquiuocation.

44 The vſe of *Æquiuocating* euen in an oath is taught by *P. R.* to be moſt lawfull, whenſoeuer a party is examined before an vnlawfull Iudge, yea or before a lawfull Iudge examining vnlawfully. Now what opinion they haue of the Magiſtrates and Officers of *England* their Prieſts haue told vs (amongſt whom is *Parſons* himſelfe) viz. that [q] *It is lawfull in England for Prieſts to equiuocate euen in their oaths before Proteſtant Magiſtrates and Officers, &c.* To let paſſe the daily experience of the profeſſed damnable practiſe heereof by M. *Garnet* and his fellowes. Wherefore this *Mitigation* ſtandeth ſtill of as great an *impoſſibility*, as it is for coſenage and ſimplicity, a lie and truth to harbour in one heart. Hitherto wee haue ſpoken of the queſtion of *Subiection*, onely mentioning *Æquiuocation*, as it is in the vſe, a bawd to *Rebellion.* Wee are therefore to ſpeake of the nature there-

[q] See *Satisf. part.* 1. *cap.* 27.

of, and to consider whether mentall Reseruation bee a lies and briefly shew

That P. R. *hath flatly ouerthrowen his whole defence of mentall Æquiuocation.* Which is made so euident, as that no wit of man can *possibly excuse him.*

§ 12.

45 SAy (*P. R.*) what is your mentall Equiuocation? [r] *We restrain our speech to Equiuocation onely, which is mentall reseruation. To wit, [I am no Priest] so, as I am bound to tell it vnto you. The first part thereof [I am no Priest] vttered with my mouth, the latter [viz. To tell it vnto you] is reserued in my mind. Which Thomas Morton saith is not an hidden truth, but a grosse lie. But I say it is a truth, because the speech agreeth with the mind of the speaker, &c.* How now would my Reader heare this noble Equiuocator confuted? by Fathers? or by his owne Doctors? or by sensible reasons? This will bee no hard matter to performe, as I hope (God willing) to auouch in due time. But heere is offered vnto mee a briefer course, more fit for a preamble, and for the triumph of truth more glorious; which is to see (as politicke *Achitophel* hanged in his owne halter) so this Doctor of the art of lying confounded by his owne assertion. I desire euery childe of truth to lend mee attention, and see

[r] P. R. Trea. *Mitig. pag.* 321. *cap.* 8. What Iesuiticall æquiuocation is.

[s] Treat. of *Mitig.* in the same *chap.*

The whole Treatise of P. R. *in defense of* Æquiuocation *subuerted by his owne consequence.*

46 The sentence of *P. R.* is to be found in these words: [t] *Let vs come* (saith he) *to the application of this example against æquiuocation, which he hath chosen to vse principally about the womans speech.* The woman is asked (*saith T. M.*) sold you the land for so much? her answer is, yea for so much, meaning but one half, & concealing the other, in which dissimulation it is impossible but that your reserued clause must haue come into her head to thinke,

[t] Treatise *Mitig. pag.* 459. *num.* 29.

Example of æquiuocating in an accursed person.

„ think, but for so much to giue in commun: or to signifie vnto
„ you. *So T. M. teacheth that poore woman to equiuocate after this*
„ *maner of equiuocation, that is to say, lie: for that now, I suppose, he*
„ *hath learned by that which hath beene set downe in our precedent*
„ *chap. that to speak an vntruth, or conceale a truth, or vse any equi-*
„ *uocation, when we are iustly demanded by our lawfull superior, and*
„ *when no iniury or violence is vsed vnto vs, is a grieuous mortall sin*
„ *in our Catholike doctrine; and consequently shee being lawfully de-*
„ *manded by S. Peter in a lawfull cause, touching her owne vow and*
„ *promise, No clause of Reseruation could saue her speech from lying,*
„ *as our Minister doth foolishly imagine.* So *P. R.*

¶ Know first (gentle Reader) that the last words, viz. [*As our Minister doth foolishly imagine,*] doe not betoken that the consequent going before, viz. [*Therefore no clause, &c.*] is my collection, but the quite contrary: for I said that a clause of *Reseruation* might aswell haue saued the womans speech from lying, as the clause which Priests vse can free a Priest: he holdeth the contrary, because (saith he) *shee being lawfully demanded, &c. no* such *clause could saue her speech from lying.* This kind of phrase is vsuall in our English tongue. As for example: a man bringeth a peece of some kind of mettall vnto a gold-smith, which the bringer thinketh to be good gold: the gold-smith after touch answereth him saying, Friend, this is not good gold, as you suppose: which words doe not signifie that the owner did not suppose it to bee good gold: and the words, *It is not gold,* were the words of the gold-smith, and not of the owner. So heere: which I therefore explane, to make it appeare that in these words, (*And consequently no clause of reseruation could saue her speech from lying*) *P. R.* hath set down his owne conclusion. And now we proceed to the maine matter in hand.

47 The supposed Æquiuocation of the *Woman* was this, *I haue sold it but for so much*, reseruing in her mind (*for ought that you shall know:*) which is agreeable to their owne example of equiuocation (*I am no Priest*) meaning (*To tell it vnto you*) This latter *P. R.* hath defended thorow his whole booke, and now of the other hee is inforced by the word of truth to say that

it is *a lie*: yea, and that, *No clause of Reseruation could saue it from a lie*: From whence it shall inuincibly follow, that Priestly Æquiuocation is a Satanicall lie. These two speeches being so semblable in themselues, if he shall say they differ, then must the difference be either in respect of the speakers, or in respect of the hearers. But first

The difference of these two kinde of equiuocations, viz. of that woman, and these Priests (the one whereof is confessed to be A lie) can not be in respect of the speakers.

48 She indeed was a woman, and a Priest is a man, but *P. R.* knoweth that it is as possible for a Priest, a man, to lie, as for a woman to tell a truth. Neither may he obiect, that her lie was in respect of her vow; for the question in this place is not about her vow vnto God, whether she had promised to sell all their possession, and to giue vp the whole price to the Apostles for the common good of the Church, or no: but it is concerning her speech vnto man about the summe and proportion of the sale of their goods, *Whether sold you your possessions for so much?* And she answering, *But for so much*; is (notwithstanding all supposed clause of Reseruation) condemned by S. Peter for a *Liar*. And this is the very case of *P. R.* for (if he be a Priest) he hath vowed himselfe to the Order of Priesthood; and yet being demanded whether he be a Priest or no, professeth it lawfull for himselfe, by mentall æquiuocation, sometime to answer, *I am no Priest*. In the next place we are to shew

[a] That he do not obiect vnto me the woman pope *Ioan.*

[a] Supra.

That (concerning the nature of a lie) there can be no difference betweene that equiuocation of the woman, and this other of these Priests, in respect of the hearers.

49 The only cloud of words which may hinder the perfect view of truth for this confession that all Æquiuocation is a lie, may seeme to be because she is sayd heerby to haue intended to deceiue S. Peter, being then a competent Iudge, whereas the Priests admit no æquiuocation except only in examinations and iudgements incompetent. But *P. R.* can not obiect this

this without groſſe and ſtupid contradiction to himſelfe thorowout his whole Treatiſe. For our queſtion is not of deceiuing, or not deceiuing, which is only the effect of lying (as *P. R.* alſo euery where acknowledgeth) but it is about the ſpeech it ſelfe, and the very nature of a lie. Now that there can be no difference heereof in regard of hearers, whether they be competent Iudges or incompetent, our *Mitigator* himſelfe will demonſtrate vnto vs.

[b] Treatiſe *Mitig.* cha. 8. num. 55. pag. 344.

First from his one expoſition of mentall Equiuocation, [b] *I ſay* (ſayth he) *that in mentall reſeruation the ſpeech agreeth with the minde of the ſpeaker, for that I truly and really meane that I am no Prieſt in that ſenſe I ſpeake it, which may be what pleaſeth me, or that which I liſt to frame to my ſelfe: ſo as I meane I am no Prieſt, ſuch as I ſhould be, or ſuch like.*

Marke, the truth of Æquiuocation is not ſuſpended vpon the vnderſtanding of the hearer, who may conceiue or miſconceiue the ſpeech, and ſo might peruert the ſpeakers truth into a lie, that ſeeming falſe to the hearer, *I am no Prieſt*, which in the ſenſe of the ſpeaker (as *P. R.* reſolueth) is by vertue of reſeruation (as *To tell it vnto you*) a perfect truth. Well then the ſuppoſed æquiuocation of the woman was ſuch a like fancie, *I have ſolde it but ſan ſo much, to give it in common*, or, *Tell it vnto you*. And yet heereof hath *P. R.* concluded, that [c] *No clauſe of reſeruation could ſaue her ſpeech from a lie.* Conſequently condemning himſelfe and all other mentall Æquiuocators for phantaſticall liars.

[c] *Supra.*

So Secondly, as we heere finde a woman making a lie vnto S. Peter, a competent Iudge, ſo do we read that S. Peter made a lie vnto a [d] *woman*, an Examiner incompetent. So that the difference of hearers doth not alter the nature of the ſpeech. The reaſon is that which hath beene already ſpecified, to wit, becauſe (as is confeſſed) [e] *The eſſence and formalitie of a lie requireth that the ſpeech diſagree from the minde and vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker.* And yet againe, [f] *A falſe ſpeech is only a lie as it hath the eſſentiall point before mentioned of diſſenting from the minde of the ſpeaker.* And laſtly, [g] *My ſpeech is truth as it is truly ſpoken in my ſenſe, not in the ſenſe of the hearer.* By all

[d] Mat. 26. 70.

[e] In the ſame place, num. 46. pag. 338.

[f] In the ſame place, num. 47.

[g] In the ſame place, num. 55. pag. 344.

which is signified, that it is not the person of the hearer, but the vnderstanding of the speaker, which maketh a lie formally a lie; and consequently, as a slander is a slander, so a lie is a lie, and truth is truth, whether it be vttered vnto man or woman; whether to Prince or people; to Simon Peter, or to Simon Magus; yea, whether to Archangell or to Sathan; Iudge competent or incompetent, it can not free a lying speech from the nature of a lie. So that seeing (notwithstanding the womans supposed clause of Reseruation) there was formally a lie in her Æquiuocation; it consequently followeth, that the Priests Æquiuocation must be as formally a lie.

An euident conuiction of P. R.

51 Thirdly, in mentall Equiuocation (sayth *P. R.*) the clause of Reseruation mixed with the outward speech maketh but one proposition, which is as true in the minde of the speaker, as if it were wholly deliuered in the outward speech. As for example: *I am no Priest*, mixed with this clause conceiued in minde, *To tell it vnto you*, is as true (in the iudgement of *P. R.*) as if it had beene without Reseruation fully expressed with the mouth, saying, *I am no Priest, to tell it vnto you*. Now then, say *P. R.* (for I meane to fetter you with your owne shackles) The woman, when she sayd to S. Peter, *I haue solde it but for so much*, if she had reserued in her minde this clause, *To giue it vnto you*: either had it beene by the vertue of Reseruation a truth, or els (notwithstanding that Reseruation) it had beene a lie. If the clause of Reseruation might haue made it a truth, then hath not *P. R.* sayd true in concluding, that *No clause of Reseruation could saue it from a lie*: if contrariwise the tricke of Reseruation could not saue it from a lie, then doth not the reserued clause, *To tell it vnto you*, being mixed with the outward speech, *I am no Priest*, make vp one true proposition. And consequently, it must be concluded of the Priestly Equiuocation, as is heere by *P. R.* confessed of the womans, viz. *No clause of Reseruation can saue their speech from a lie*. For if she had sayd vnto S. Peter in plaine words [*I haue solde it but for so much to giue it in common*] or such like, this euery one knoweth had beene a true speech: yet saying, *I solde it but for so much*, with mentall reseruation, reseruing in her minde [*To*

A plaine demonstration.

giue

giue in common, or, *To tell it vnto you*] was notwithstanding this Reseruation (euen by the iudgement of *P. R.*) a flat lie.

The lying woman and the lying Priests paralleled.

52 Let vs, for conclusion, parallel both these examples which are very neere a kinne: for if we doe compare speaker with speaker, that is, the *woman* and a *Priest*, both will be thought to be Votaries: if outward speech with outward speech, that is, [h] *I haue solde it but for so much*, and, *I am no Priest*, both are negatiues: if Reseruation with Reseruation, as [*To tell it vnto you*] or [*To giue vnto you*] both are mentall: if the forme with forme, both equally answerable to the mind of the speaker: if, finally, end with end, both are to deceiue the hearer. Wherefore *P. R.* granting, that *No clause of Reseruation could saue her speech from a lie*, must by irrepugnable consequence be forced to confesse, that his [*I am no Priest*] vttered by a Priest, to whomsoeuer it be spoken (notwithstanding any mentall Reseruation of [*To tell it vnto you &c.*) is a Satanicall and damnable lie.

[h] For, *But for so much* hath the nature of a negatiue, & is as much as, *Not for any more.*

53 And where is now *P. R.* his boast of Scriptures, Fathers, Reasons? where is his challenge of Canonists and Schoolediuines? where is his appeale vnto both our Vniuersities? nay, where is this man *P. R.* himselfe, the new select Aduocate for this cause? may he not say hereafter, *I was ashamed, and therefore I hid my selfe?* so naked doth his deformitie appeare. He hath sayd, That his Aduersarie *T. M.* is like one, who, when the game is desperate, will notwithstanding play it out, and see the last man borne. Heere hee himselfe hath made such a blot as can not but be the vnfallible losse of his whole game, who being pressed with this example out of [i] Scripture, is driuen to such a *vertigo* and giddinesse, that euen when he would defend his Art of Equiuocating from a lie, is by consequence from Gods Word forced to confesse an outward speech, which *No clause of Reseruation could saue from a lie.* Whereby his owne *Magi* (I doubt not) will be brought to acknowledge, that *digitus Dei hic est*, this is the power of Gods truth. Thus being contented, for this present, to haue my whole cause in both questions, *Æquiuocation* and *Rebellion* so iustifiable, that my Aduersarie his owne confessi-

[i] Act. 5.

ons,

ons may free me from his imputation of ſlander; I doe with better alacritie proceed vnto his next challenge, yeelding

A generall Anſwer to his accuſation of malicious falſhoods.

§. 13.

THe ſumme of all is this: *P. R.*[k] *I haue taken Thomas Morton in ſo many falſifications of things alleged by him, as before you haue ſeene. And the law ſayth, Whoſoeuer is once euill, is preſumed to be ſo ſtill, vntill he proue the contrarie.*[l] *But he hath bewrayed euery-where malicious falſhoods.*

[k] Treatiſe *Mitig.* c. 11. num. 3. pa. 441.

[l] In ỹ Preface, and elſwhere.

54 From the imputation of *malice* againſt the perſons of men, if I ſhould need the teſtimonie of man, my Aduerſaries may acquit me, who haue acknowledged in me better meaſures by their owne experience, as *M. D. Wri. M. Conſt. M. Ga.* I haue halfe iniuried them with halfe naming them: but I hope they will pardon me this wrong, knowing that it is not ſpoken in exprobration to them, but for iuſtification of my ſelfe, foraſmuch as ſelfe-commendation, if forced, is (in the iudgement of the Apoſtle) a wiſe *follie*. Howſoeuer, I can not vnderſtand, how any man beholding others with Chriſtian eyes, ſhould be *malicious*: for either he perceiueth them wandring from grace and ſaluation, which mooueth pitie; or els diſcerneth them to be companions with him in the way of life, which worketh loue. But neither can *malice* be pitifull, nor loue *malicious*. If my Aduerſaries ſhall further perſiſt in this deſpightfull obiection of *malice*, they muſt giue me leaue rather to feare Gods denunciation of *Woe*, than their *Wrath*.

Why we may not malice anie mans perſon.

[m] *Woe vnto them* (ſayth God) *that put light for darkneſſe, and darkneſſe for light, that put bitter for ſweet, and ſweet for ſowre.* And if I prooue not their doctrine concerning *Rebellion* and *Æquiuocation* to be as *bitter* as the water of *Meribah*, then let them note me for a man aboue the nature of mankinde *malicious*. Otherwiſe, I muſt expoſtulate with them according to the Apoſtles example: * *Am I your enemie, becauſe I tell you*

[m] Eſa. 5. 20.

* Gal. 4. 16.

the truth? Which truth in my *Incounter* to the *Mitigator* (God willing) I shall shortly auouch.

Thus from *malice* the gangrene of a wicked conscience, we come vnto *falshood*, the [a] cut-throat therof. Concerning which two things must be discussed: First the protestation *P.R.* maketh, in iustifying the sinceritie of all Romish writers, presuming them to be free from all falshood: Secondly, his accusation against my selfe, whom he hath notoriously traduced. Now of both these orderly.

[a] He that lieth slayeth his owne soule. Sap. 1. 11.

P. R. *his hypocriticall, prodigall, and indeed prodigious* ostentation, in the auouching of the integritie of *Romish writers, and freeing them from* all note of wilfull falsifications.

§ 14.

[b] Treatise of *Mitigat.* pag. 489. chap. 12. num. 11.

55 [b] „ IN this then, if you please to insist a while, and let Thomas „ Morton bring forth any Catholike authors whatsoeuer, „ that wrote against Protestants since these heresies began, that hath „ beene taken in this impietie, I meane, that hath set downe in Print „ any such falsitie, as cannot be excused either by ignorance, ouer- „ sight, negligence, error of print, translation, diuersitie of editions, „ or the like, but that it must needs be presumed, that he knew the „ vntruth, and yet would set it forth: of this kinde (I say) let him „ shew me but one example among all Catholike writers of our time, „ and I will in my conscience greatly mistrust, and discredit the Au- „ thor, whether it be another or my selfe: But if he shew me two or „ three in any writer of this kinde, I shall neuer be able to beleeue „ him more. And whereas the number and varietie of Catho- „ like writers is so great, as the world seeth, it were no great labour „ to shew it in some, if that spirit did reigne among them.

[c] *Mitig.* cap. 3. pag. 89.

56 What if one of his late Authours haue beene found presumptuously false in any one report, or els any one but in three points, though this be euen his owne selfe? Doth the man (who maketh mention of his * *Interruption by sickneſſe*) know what

what he hath now sayd? whether he spoke this being in his seauer-fit, or in temper? whether in a dreame, or awake? whether in his right minde, or in distraction? For sure I am, that this ostentation will proue in the issue as infortunate vnto *P. R.* as euer was boast either by *Thraso* on the Stage, or by *Goliah* in the Campe, or by *Gorgias* in Schooles: by the which he must be driuen vnto so miserable and shamefull a palinodie, as euer heereafter vtterly to discredit his owne friends, and worke a perpetuall discontent within himselfe, as presently will fully appeare.

P. R. his vnluckie ostentation.

57 But before I can come to manifest this, I may not denie euen this my Aduersarie his due commendation of modestie, who being ashamed (we may thinke) of the Romish frauds and falsifications of former times, will insist only vpon such mens examples as haue professedly written of late against *Protestants*. It were to be wished, that his fellow Iesuit *Costerus* had kept himselfe within the same precincts; but he maketh a more generall challenge, thus: [p] *Nemo hactenùs vel Princeps, vel Præsul, vel Scriptor fuit, qui mendacij, vel malæ fidei Romanos arguerit*: that is: *Neuer yet* (sayth he) *did any Prince, or Prelate, or Writer accuse the Romanists of falshood.* When he could not be ignorant of that which their owne volume of Councels hath made obseruable for perpetuall remembrance, how three Popes, *Sozimus*, *Bonface*, and *Celestine*, at the Councell of *Carthage* in Afrike, did claime a right of appeales vnto Rome by vertue of a Canon of the Councell of *Nice*, as they pretended. And when all the ancient copies of that Councell had been diligently sought, it appeared by the testimony of three Patriarks, viz. of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, [q] *That that Canon concerning Appeales to the Bishop of Rome* (as their Lindan speaketh) *could not be found in those Copies*: Or, as the Councell it selfe speaketh: [r] *Istius Concilij Africani seu Carthaginensis ducenti tres tribus Papis restiterunt, & Canonem Concilij in defensionem Primatus sui fallsum esse deprehenderunt.* A little after: *Concludunt tandem nemini licere ad Romanum Pontificem prouocare*: that is: *Two hundred and three Fathers of the Councell of Carthage resisted the three*

[p] *Costerus Ies. Enchirid. cap. De summo pontif.* §. Constat.

Three Popes falsificators.

[q] In quibus non erat Canon ille de appellando ad Rom. Pontificem deprehensus. *Lindanus Panopl. lib. 4. cap. 89.*

[r] *Liber Conc. De Actis Conc. Carthag. 6.*

three Popes, and found, That they ſuggeſted a falſe Canon for defence of their Primacie. Therefore in the end they concluded, That it ſhould not be lawfull for any of Afrike to appeale vnto the Biſhop of Rome. Will *P. R.* beleeue any claimes which Popes make for Papall iuriſdiction, ſeeing that three Patriarks, and two hundred and three Biſhops, haue conuinced three Popes of ſo apparent a falſhood as this? Or what can be ſayd for the defence of *Gratian* their publike Compiler of the Decrees of Popes, [f] *who* (as Cardin. Bellar. witneſſeth) *citing a Canon of a Councell of Mileuet, wherein it was decreed that none ſhould appeale beyond the ſea, did ad of himſelfe this exception, Except it be vnto the Apoſtolike ſea* of Rome: *when as that Councell in forbidding appeales beyond the ſea, did eſpecially intend to forbid appeales to Rome?*

Gratian a falſificator.

[f] Concil. Mileuetanũ ſtatuit nè quis ad tranſmarina loca putauerit appellandũ: Reſpondent aliqui cum Gratiano, qui addidit ad hunc Canonem exceptionem, Niſi forte ad Apoſtolicam ſedem appelletur. Sed hæc exceptio non videtur quadrare, Nam præcipuè propter Rom. Eccleſiam Africani ſtatuerant, vt non liceret appellare vltra mare. *Bellar. lib. 2. De Rom. Pont. cap. 24. § tertiò.*

58 Many ſuch like falſhoods might be alleged, wherin Popes and Popiſh ones haue intangled themſelues, and deluded the world, not in ſchoole caſes of *Sic videtur, & non*, or in ſtrifes *de ſtillicidijs*, and ſuch trifles: but about the right of *Appeales*, yea ſpirituall and alſo temporall iuriſdictions. But the nature of a Preamble will not ſuffer me to purſue old forgeries: and I muſt yeeld ſomthing vnto *P. R.* his modeſty, who to paſſe ouer the blemiſhes of ancient Authors, doth challenge onely an inſtance in new writers, whether it bee of his fellowes, or of himſelfe. And I will endeuor to giue him ſatisfaction in both. And firſt tender

A Satisfaction vnto P. R. *his firſt Motion concerning his fellowes, who haue intangled themſelues in open falſifications.*

59 Though it be iuſt in God, who is iuſtice it ſelfe, to impoſe this law vpon man, *He that offendeth in one is guilty in all*: yet man with man may bee more partiall, than for the guilt of one teſtimony to renounce him in all. And *P. R.* is more mercifull, therefore he requireth three ſenſible inſtances, as it were three

witnesses against any one. And yet this also is horribly vnmercifull on their part. I wish hee had but named any one, whose credit he valueth most, that I might haue answered his challenge in that one. Howsoeuer it wil be no more easie a task for me to find one falshood in many, then many in one: whereof I exhibit some examples, and

First a notable spectacle of their own manifold contradictions in peruerting three testimonies of antiquity in one controuersie.

The First testimony.

60 In the Controuersie about Images the Protestants appeale vnto antiquity both of Councels and Fathers: the first Councell is that of *Eliberis* about the yeere of Grace 305. which [1] Protestants vrge as forbidding that there should be any Images in the church. Now let vs trie the spirits of their answerers. [2] *Payua* answereth that, *They meant only to forbid such an Image as was made to represent the nature of God.* Not so, saith Bellarmine, [3] *For such images were not then in vse.* The second, they forbad *Images*, (saith Sanders) vpon a particular occasion peculiar to that time: to wit, [4] *For feare lest the Heathen seeing Images in the Churches of Christians might thinke that Christians worshipped them idolatrously, as did the Heathen.* So hee. [5] *This is a good answer*, (saith Bellarmine:) although in the same place he confesse that that same reason of the Canon [6] *agreeth not much with this exposition.* Which is a very charitable defence, and all one, by interpretation, as if he had said, The answer is good, but that it is naught. We expect a better. The third, They were forbid (saith *Alanus Copus* and others) not

[1] Opponit Caluinus Canonem 36. Conc. Eliberitini, in quo sic dicitur, Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, nè quod colitur aut adoratur in in parietibus depingatur.] Huic variè respondent Catholici *Vasques Iof. de Adorat. l. 2. disp. 5. c. 2. num. 120.*

[2] Payua respondet, solùm prohiberi imaginem Dei, quæ pingitur ad effigiem Dei representandam. *To whom* (3) *Bellar.* Sed non videtur satisfacere, tùm quia loquitur Conc. de picturis in genere, tùm quia huiusmodi imagines non erant in vsu eo tempore. *Bellar. l. 2. Imag. cap. 9.* (4) Nicolaus Sanderus l. 2. de cultu Imag. c. 4. respondet, Concilium illud prohibuisse imagines in templis, quia tempus & locus id requirebat: tunc enim periculum erat, nè Gentiles existimarent nostros adorare ligna & lapides. (5) Hæc solutio bona est. *Bellar. l. 2. de Imag. c. 9. §. Nicolaus. Immediately after speaking of the same answer:* (6) Fateor tamen rationem illam Canonis (nè id quod adoratur & colitur in parietibus depingatur) non multùm quadrare huic expositioni. *Idem ibidem.*

becauſe *Chriſtians* ſeemed to commit Idolatrie with thoſe Images, [7] *But becauſe they did ſo indeed.* But, [8] *This expoſition* (ſaith Bellarmine) *is not agreeable to the Canon.* Therefore Sanders, Allen, Turrian, and Bellarmine, all foure, reſolue vpon a fourth anſwer, telling vs that thoſe Images [9] *were forbid to be painted vpon wals, leſt that in that time of perſecution they might haue beene made a ſcorne and contempt vnto Infidels.* But [10] *I cannot allow of this expoſition* (ſaith the Ieſuit Vaſques) *becauſe it agreeth not with the intention of the Canon.* Wherefore hee deuiſeth another which wee may call the fift, and which hee calleth *the beſt*, ſaying: [11] *They were forbid to be painted on wals, leſt by the decay of the wals they might loſe their luſtre: but yet were not forbid to be painted in tables.* Which *beſt* how good it may ſeeme to be, may appeare by their ſixt and laſt anſwer.

[7] Alanus Copus in Dialog. l. 5. c. 16. dicit hic prohiberi imagines, quia ab illis Chriſtianis adorari cœperant, tãquam Dij, & hunc eſſe ſenſum; Placuit in eccleſia non eſſe picturas, nè aliquid in parietibus exiſtens adoretur & colatur vt Deus. In quem ſenſum accipit iſtum Canonem *B. Ivo* in ſuis Decretis, par. 3. c. 40. *Bellarm. quo iam ſupra.* Hanc interpretationem amplectuntur Martinus de Ayala, & Sixtus Senenſis Bibl. l. 5. Annot. 247. *Vaſques De Adorat. l. 2. diſp. 5. c. 2. num. 126.* [8] Sed huic etiam expoſitioni ratio Canonis non omninò quadrat, nam debuiſſet dici potiùs, Nè id quod pingitur adoretur, quàm, Nè id quod adoratur pingatur. *Bellar. quo ſup.* §. Alanus. *And another*, Mihi non probatur: Si enim à Patribus illius Concilij zelo religionis ita factum eſſet, vt omnes imagines etiam in tabulis depictæ, aut in materia aliqua ſculptæ è templis eijcerentur, Gregorium Magnum poſteà non latuiſſet, &c. *Vaſques quo ſup. num.* 127. [9] Altera interpretatio Alani accommodatior eſſe videtur, quam ſequuntur etiam Sanderus l. 2. Ador. c. 4. & noſter Franciſcus Turrianus l. 3. de dogmat. charact. Dicunt ergo pro tempore & loco ſummoperè fuiſſe conueniens, imagines è templis auferre; Imminente enim Gentilium perſecutione, quæ ſanè in Eccleſia Dei adhuc perſeuerabat (vt ex multis Canonib. illius Concilij colligitur) oportebat Chriſtianos ſecum imagines deferre, & occultare, nè in templis ludibrio Gentilium expoſitæ manerent. Id autem fieri non poterat, ſi in parietibus templi, benè tamen ſi in tabulis depingerentur, aut in materia aliqua ſculperentur, &c. *Vaſques ibid. num.* 128. *Another*: Huic expoſitioni aptiſſimè conuenit ratio Canonis. *Bellarm. De Imag. lib. 2. cap. 9.* §. Alij ergo dicunt. [10] Cæterùm ſecunda illa interpretatio Canonis 36. mihi non probatur, quòd cum ratione, quam in ipſo Canone Concilium expreſſit, minimè conueniat. Ideò enim dicit, Placuit imagines in Eccleſia eſſe non debere, nè ſcilicet quod adoratur in parietibus depingatur. Si tamen prædicta interpretatio vera eſſet, dicere potiùs deberet in hunc modum, Placuit in parietibus Eccleſiæ imagines non depingi, nè perſecutoribus fidei noſtrę ludibrio eſſe poſſunt. *Vaſques ib. nu.* 131. [11] Interpretatio, quæ mihi cæteris omnibus præferenda videtur, hæc eſt, Non prohiberi imagines in tabulis depictas aut in alia materia ſculptas, ſed ſolùm in ipſis templi parietibus depingi: indicat enim Concilium indecens eſſe, vt id quod colitur parietibus ſit affixum, ſed debere potius in tabula aut alia materia reuerenter collocari, nè ſplendorem amittat. *Vaſques lib. 2. De Adorat. diſp. 5. cap. 2. num.* 132.

[12] *Diuers*

[12] *Diuers late Diuines* (saith the Iesuit) *oppressed with this obiection, taken from the Councell of Eliberis, haue thought it their best refuge to denie the authority of the Councell, because it was but prouinciall, and neuer confirmed by the Pope. Which refuge* (saith he) *might serue vs in good stead, if a better could not bee found.* And though Bellarmine and Baronius made the [13] same Answer, yet this latter together with Binius confesse and proue that, *It was a lawfull Councell, and free from all errour.* So that whatsoeuer the occasion of forbidding might haue been, this is a confessed conclusion of Senensis, that [14] *The Councell of Eliberis did absolutely forbid the worship of images.* Which one testimony being so tortured by so distracted and contradictory Answers, as though they had professed to proue each other a liar: it cannot be (especially seeing some of them are confessed to haue beene *oppressed with the force of this obiection*) but diuers of them must incurre (for ought that man can see) the guilt of wilfull falsification. The like is as manifest in

[12] Recentiores aliqui pondere illius Concilij quasi oppressi, tàquam optimũ effugium elegerunt, authoritatem Concilij negare, quòd prouinciale fuerit 19. Episcoporum tantùm, nec ab vllo summo Pontifice cõfirmatum. Existimant verò nullius debere esse authoritatis, quia etiam in multis alijs Canonibus manifestè errauerit, denegans viz. Pœnitentiæ sacramentum in extrema necessitate propter aliqua angentia crimina: aut, vt alijs placet, Communionem Eucharistiæ, id quod errorem etiam intolerabilem esse autumant. Atque hac forsan de causa Canus l. 5. de locis. c. 4. post sextam conclusionem de Conc. Elibertino, inquit, eâ parte, quâ erravit, semper à Catholicis explosum fuisse. Et sanè si aliâ viâ Concilio satisfieri commodè non possit, hoc nobis effugium sufficiat: nec Caluinus contra vniuersalem Ecclesiæ definitionem prouinciale Concilium obijcere deberet. *Vasquez ib. q. sup. num.* 121. [13] Etiam Canus loc. Theol. Bellar. l. 2. Imag. c. 36. Hanc Synodum aiunt erroneam esse, & à nullo Romano Pontifice confirmatam. Baronius Tom. 1. Anno 57. num. 119. ob eandem causam quasi propè fines Nouatiani dogmatis Conc. hoc attigisset, paulò liberiùs & acriùs de eo scripsit. Sed ea deinceps Tom. 2. Anno 305. num. 42. valdè mitigat, ita enim de eodem Canone [Lapsos nè quidem in articulo mortis absoluendos] cùm quæ ab illis de ea re statuta sunt ab Innocentio Pontifice excusentur, nemo sit qui accusare præsumat. Existimat igitur hanc Synodum legitimam fuisse, atque ab omni errore liberam. *Binius De Conc. Comment. in hunc Canonem, pag.* 245. [14] Populus Christianus recèns à superstitione ad Christianismum adductus, ad idololatriam nimis pronus erat, idcircò omninò voluit Synodus Elibertina imaginũ cultum. *Sixtus Senens. Bibliot. lib. 5. Annot.* 247.

The Second testimony, from the Councell of Francford.

61 Protestants obiect the Councell of *Francford*, which condemned (they say) the second Councell of *Nice* for approuing the worship of Images: heerupon their Aduersary *Surius* doth bitterly inueigh against them, calling Protestants

[1] *Men of such incredible impudency, and so dissolute lust of lying, that it is a maruell they dare appeare in the presence of any honest man.* A fearefull crimination. Shall we know the cause? [2] *Because they would craftily perswade men to beleeue that the second Councell of Nice was condemned in the Councell of Francford for the point of the worship of Images, when as they corrupted those Councels, albeit by the marüellous prouidence of God their fraud is made notorious, for they forgot to race out the name of Constantinople, and put in stead thereof the Councell of Nice.* Was it then the Synod of *Constantinople*, that was condemned in the Councell of *Francford*, and not the second Synode of *Nice*? [3] *No,* (say nine of our Aduersaries together) *the second Synode of Nice was not condemned, but rather confirmed in the Councell of Francford, by three hundred Bishops there.* Now it is like that by these mens verdict Protestants shall be adiudged vnto the Pillory, for *Surius* is the chiefe of that inquest, who hath said, that Protestants sought by forgerie to corrupt a Councell. Can there be a more grieuous accusation than this? But behold one Vasques a Iesuite, as it were another *Daniel*, ready to acquit the innocent, saying and prooving that [4] *The sentence of Surius*

[1] Hæreticorum nostrorum, qui se Euangelicos dici volunt, incredibilis impudentia in hoc apparet, quòd docere velint in Concilio Francofordensi damnari Conc. Nicænum secundum: adferunt pro se Decretum Francofordiense Synodi, quo illorum deplorata mentiendi & quidlibet fingendi libido ita coarguitur, vt mirum sit illos vnquam in cuiusquam boni viri ausos esse prodire conspectum. *And a little after.* [2] Vbi homines versuti vellent persuadere Lectori Nicænam secundam de adorandis imaginibus damnatam esse, decretum Francofordiense corruperunt quidem, sed mirabili Dei iudicio, vt illorum impostura omnibus proderetur, obliti sunt Constantinopolin eradere, atque eius loco Nicæam substituere. &c. *A little after.* Sed valeant isti cùm malis suis artibus *Surius Præf. in Synod. Francofordi.* [3] Concilium Francofordiense prouinciale fuit, in quo Episcopi 300, &c. Acta Concilij Nicæni secundi in causa imaginum confirmârunt. *Paulò post.* Ita docuit Alanus Copus, Sanderus, Surius, Suarez. *Huckenus Binius Com. in hanc Synod. pag* 429. Scriptores illi cùm dicunt Synodum 7. in Francofor. Conc. damnatam, non intelligunt Nicænam secundam, quæ verè septima fuit, sed damnabant Ephesinam secundam. *Coster. Ies. Enchir. ca.* 13. Multi recentiores historici dicunt in Francfordiensi non damnari Synodum de adorandis imaginibus, sed de tollendis, Platina, Blandius, Sabellicus. *Bellar. l. 2. De Cont. cap.* 8. [4] Huic (*sententiæ Surij*) duo manifestè obstant, vnum est, quòd si Francofor. Synodus de Constantinop. Concilio loqueretur, non diceret [Quam pro adorandis imaginibus fecerunt] ea enim contra imaginum venerationem celebrata est. Loquitur ergo, sicut Historici omnes, de vera septima Synodo Nicæna secunda, quæ reuerà pro adorandis imaginibus habita fuit: alterum est, quod præfatio asserit, vt referunt Authores, Synodum illam, quam abrogauit Concilium Francoford. celebratam fuisse in Bithynia, in qua quidem prouincia est Nicæa, non autem Constantinopolis. *Vasques l. 2. Imag. c. 4. num.* 225.

can

cannot ſtand, being contrary vnto all Hiſtorians, who affirme that the ſecond Synod of Nice, and not the Synode of Conſtantinople, is mentioned in the Councell. And of *Francford* Bellarmine more plainely acknowledgeth that that Synode of *Nice was condemned in the Councell of Francford in this point of the worſhip of Images.* And therefore can do no leſſe but [5] *wiſh that it were otherwiſe.* Laſtly [6] Baronius alſo doth agree with Bellarmine. What will *P. R.* iudge of thoſe three Ieſuites, *Sanders, Suarez, Coſter,* with their complices, who maintaine that the ſecond Synode of *Nice* was confirmed in the Councell of *Francford,* wherin (in the opinion of Bellar.) it was condemned? or how will he cenſure *Surius*, who chargeth Proteſtants with impudency and forgerie in ſuch degree, as though they were vnwoorthy the company of men; and when the matter is examined, by three Ieſuites, their oppoſite Aduerſaries, Vaſques, Bellarmine and Baronius, the defenſe of Proteſtants is warranted for true? Will now our *P. R.* call *Surius, Furius,* (who hath publiſhed the bodie of Councels) and annihilate all his credit heereafter?

62 But I proceed to their ſecond Anſwer, [7] *Though the Councell of Francford* (ſay their two Cardinals) *did condemne the Councell of Nice in this point, yet did it erre heerein in a queſtion not of faith but of fact, for being deceiued by reports of the Author of thoſe bookes, which are entituled in the name of* Charles *the Emperour, they did erroneouſly thinke that the Councell did allow, that Images ſhould be worſhipped with an honour proper vnto God.* This anſwer alſo is ſo preiudicious to their owne cauſe, that their owne Doctors Vaſques, Suares, and Binius doc o-

[5] Sententiam Alani optarem eſſe veram, ſed ſuſpicor eſſe falſam, quia &c. *Bellar. l. 2. Conc. c. 8. §.* Propter hanc. *Et paulò poſt,* Videtur igitur mihi in Francoford. Concilio verè reprobatam fuiſſe Nicænam ſecundam.

[6] Reuerendiſ. Cardin. Baronius hanc ſententiam veriorem eſſe iudicat. *Binius Comm. in Conc. Francof. pag. 391. col. 1.*

[7] Damnauit illa quidem Nicænam ſecundam, ſed per errorem & materialiter, eo prorſus modo, quo Synodus Ariminenſis damnabat homouſion. Nam Author Carolinorum Synodo impoſuit per duo mendacia; vnum erat, illam Synodum cultum latriæ imaginibus oblatam approbâſſe. *Bellarm. l. 2. De Conc. c. 8. §.* Videtur. *Et paulò poſt.* Concilium Francof. quod frequentiſſimum fuit, errare potuit, & errauit non in iuris ſed in facti quæſtione: nec mirum eſt quòd errare potuit, quia non conſenſerunt legati Romani, vt Magdeburgenſes dicunt: Papa autem non modò non conſenſit, verùm etiam reprobauit illud Concilium, vt patet ex libro Adriani, &c. *Bellar. ib. §.* Si dicas. Idem ſenſit illuſtriſſ. Cardinalis Baronius, Patres Francof. Concilij mendacijs & impoſturis Autorum libri Carolini fuiſſe deceptos, vt Nicænam ſecundam, quaſi ipſa imagines cultu latriæ, ſoli Deo debito, colendas ſanxiſſet. *Teſte Binio, Comm. in Conc. Francof. pa. 397. But,*

openly confute it, prouing first that the Councell of *Francford* [8] *Could not bee deceiued* by that information. Secondly, that the [9] *Legates of the Pope* did subscribe vnto it. Thirdly, that the contrary answer [10] *standeth not vpon any sound ground*. And if I shall obiect the answer of Bellarmine, I thinke *P. R.* will returne mee no satisfaction: here to allow the Councell of Francford thus farre, as to thinke it did not erre in a question *of right or faith*, but only failed in an errour of *fact*. Tell me in good earnest *P. R.* if the Fathers of the Councell of *Francford* iudging that the second Councell of *Nice*, confirmed by the Pope, did erre in defending Idolatrie, did they erre in faith or no? if they did, then where was the faith of Bellarmine and Baronius, who say it did not erre in question of *faith*? if those Fathers iudging the Councell of Nice to erre in faith, did not erre themselues then it is not preiudiciall to faith to think that *The Pope* and his Councell may erre in defending Idolatrie, and consequently heresie, and what not? Therefore yet they haue not satisfied the Protestants obiection.

63 Their last refuge is to contemne it as being only a [11] Prouinciall Councell: and amongst others their Binius teacheth his fellowes how to wind themselues out of this whirle-poole. [12] *We must necessarily confesse* (saith he) *that either our Historians haue erred, or else the Acts of the Councell haue beene corrupted, or else that it condemned some other false Councell: or else freely denie that it maketh neither for vs, nor against vs.* He might haue added, Or else let vs grant (as we ought) the obiection of Protestants to be true. To all the other not the equity of the case, but desperate necessity hath inforced them, as may appeare by their intestine warre among themselues, one of them prouing anothers answer to be flatly repugnant vnto the te-

[8] Definitio septimæ Synodi non minus nota esse potuit Conc. Francofordiensi, quàm Autorib. libri Carolini, siquidem eodem tempore liber ille conscriptus fuit. *Vasques Adorat. l. 2. disp. 7. cap. 5. num. 230.*

[9] *Rursus* Concilium Francof. habuit Legatos Adriani Pont. vt tradunt omnes in quæstione præcedenti citati, & ex subscriptionibus cõstat, atq; hæretici Centuriatores fatentur. *Ibid. num. 238.*

[10] Ego cum viro doctissimo Francisco Suarez sentio, istam responsionem infirmis niti fundamentis. *Binius q. supra.*

[11] Si Conc. Francofordiense aliquid contra Synodum septimam (*which was* Nicæna secunda) statuisset, tamen nullius esset momenti, tum quia Prouinciale non valet contra generale, tum quia non erat à Pontifice Romano approbatum. *Bellar. l. 2. De Imag. c. 14.*

[12] Necessario igitur fatendum est, vel Historicos errasse, vel aliqua ex parte depraua-tos esse, vel certè non de vera, sed de Pseudosynodo loquutos esse. Denique possit quis liberè negare quicquam actum esse in Francof. Synodo siue pro Imaginibus, siue contra illas. *Binius Tom. 3. Conc. Comment. in Conc. Francof.*

nor

nor of the Councel which could not haue been without grosse falsitie on some part. Wherefore we conclude with the saying of the Iesuite Suares: [12] *It is a dangerous rashnesse to reiect the Acts of that Councell of Francford as false*: And proceed vnto

[12] Periculosum & temerarium est, acta illius Concilij veluti suppositicia & apocrypha reijcere, quia nihil in eis actis, vt nunc extant, reperitur, quod non ad veram religionem stabiliendam valeat. *Suares Iesu. disp. 49. sect. 3. Teste Binio, in loco supra citato.*

The Third example.

64 Protestants obiect the testimony of the auncient Father [1] *Epiphanius*, who by his owne report entred into a Church at *Anablatha* to pray, and perceiuing a curtaine, wherein was a *Picture as if it had beene the image of Christ, or some Saint, hee tooke the curtaine and rent it*, as being an abuse *contrary to the authority of holy Scriptures*. Our Aduersaries are changeable to answer thereunto. Therefore first *Waldensis* is bold, and saith that *Epiphanius did this vpon a good zeale, but not according to knowledge, all for feare of giuing aduantage vnto the Anthropomorphites*. But Cardinall Bellarmine cuts him short, telling him, that [2] *His answer is confuted by the text*. The next is Vasques the Iesuite, noting Protestants for dullards, who could not perceiue that the image, which *Epiphanius* rent, [3] *Was not the image of a Saint, but of some prophane man*. But Cardinall Bellarmine will tell him, that, [4] *There is a better and more common answer than this*. Sure, for this is naught, forasmuch as their *Senensis* hath taught them that *Epiphanius* in other his Epistles

[1] Obijciunt Protestantes nobis Epiphanium, qui in Epistola ad Iohannem Hierosolymitanũ sic scribit. Cùm venissem, inquit, ad villam Anablatha, & in Ecclesiam intrâssem, vt orarem, inueni ibi velum pendens in foribus eiusdem Ecclesiæ, habens imaginem quasi

Christi aut Sancti alicuius: cumque vidissem in Ecclesia Christi, contra authoritatem Scripturarum, hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud velum, &c. *Vasquez Iesu. lib. 2. de Adorat. disp. 5. cap. 3. num. 136. Bellar. lib. 2. de Triumph. Eccl. cap. 9. §. 2.* [2] Hoc fecit Epiphanius propter periculum erroris Anthopomorphitarum, qui Deum corporeum, & membris compactum esse asserebant. *Waldens. Tom. 3. tit. 19. cap. 157.* Sic quidem Waldensis, qui reprehendit in Epiphanio zelum nimium, & non secundum scientiam. [3] Verùm Waldensem textus ipse refutat, non enim erat Dei imago, sed hominis cuiusdam. Ergo non potuit Epiphanius hac occasione morus velum obscindere. *Vasq. q. sup. disp. 5. c. 3. num. 137.* [4] Hinc intelligi potest, quàm non iudicio ingenij fuit Calvinus, & alij, qui hoc nobis testimonium obijciunt. Si enim attentè legatur Epiphanius ne verbum quidem de sanctorum imaginibus habet. *Vasquez q. sup. c. 3. num. 144.* Sed loquitur de imagine hominis prophani, quæ in sanctarum imaginum Catalogo ferenda non est. *Ibid. cap. 4. num. 148.* [5] Alij dicant loqui de imagine hominis profani, sed communior & verior solutio est, verba, &c. *Bellar. lib. 2. de Triumph. Eccl. cap. 9.*

[6] *Doth forbid Images to be brought into the Church.* We require therfore a better answer than this. *Alphonsus de Castro*, to rid his hands of *Epiphanius*, numbreth him among those whom hee calleth [7] *Iconomachos hæreticos*, hereticall Image-breakers. This will not be currant with Vasques, who supposing that it was the Image of some prophane man, saith that [8] *Epiphanius did well to take it away.* As yet nothing is said which may giue satisfaction. Where is that which was called the *Common answer?* [9] Allen, Sanders, Costor, Bellarmine haue all resolued to cut the knot, which they cannot vntie, and therefore say, *The Epistle in that part is forged or corrupted by Heretikes.* It is no maruell they be so briefe, for Vasques hath told vs, that those which answered thus [10] *Were oppressed with the difficulty.* Wherefore he concludeth directly, [11] *That without all doubt the Epistle is not counterfet.* It may bee Bellarmine will not speake any thing without reason: [12] *Hierome* (saith he) *in his Epistle vnto Pammachius against Iohn Bishop of Hierusalem, doth translate almost this whole Epistle into Latine, and yet maketh no mention of this part of the Epistle concerning this image. Therfore is this part counterfet.* Who would thinke that this great Rabbi could haue beene ignorant of that which any man may see, and his owne learned Doctors haue acknowledged, that [13] *The Epistle which is translated and approoued by S. Hierome,*

[6] Epiphanius in alia Epistola, quæ in actis primæ Synodi citatur, Estote, inquit, memores, dilecti filij, nè in Ecclesias imagines inferatis, nec in cœmiterijs statuatis. *Sixtus Senens. Bibl. l. 5. Annot. 247.*

[7] Epiphanius inter Iconomachos hæreticos fuit. *Alphons. de Castro hæres. Tit. Imago.*

[8] Velum habens quasi Christi aut Sancti cuiusdam: Illa vox [Quasi] significat hominis profani imaginē ibi pependisse, tanquam esset imago aut Christi aut Sancti alicuius: ideoq; merito fuisse abscissam. *Vasquez quo supra. cap. 4. num. 149.* [9] Alanus & Sanderus difficultate oppressi responderunt, verba supositicia esse. *Vasquez ibid. num. 140.* Corrupta est hæc Epistola à veteribus Iconoclastris. *Costerus Jesuita Enchirid. cap. 13. §. Corrupta.* Esse quidem suppositicia probatur, primò, secundò, tertiò, &c. nonò. *Bellar. quo supra.* [10] *See in the next number before.* [11] Verba, quæ alij suppositia esse putant ad eandem epistolam sine dubio pertinent, nam postquam Epiphanius se excusabat ad Iohannem Hierosol. de erroribus, quos Iohannes in eo notasset, meritò aliam causam, cur alij de se murmurarent, subiunxit, dicens, Cum veniissem Anablatha, &c. *Vasquez Jes. lib. 2. de Adorat. disp. 5. cap. 3.* [12] Hieronymus in Epistola ad Pammachium contra Iohannem Hierosol. Episcopum, totam ferè hanc epistolam Epiphanij à se Latinè factam recitat, & tamen non meminit huius veli. Ergo illa verba suppositicia esse videntur. *Bellar. l. 2. de Triumph. Eccle. cap. 9.* [13] Est Epistola Epiphanij ab Hieronymo translata & approbata in hæc verba [Cum veniissem Anablatha. *Senens. l. 5. Bibl. Annot. 247.* Hæc epistola Epiphanij de velo ponitur inter Epistolas Hieronymi, ordine 60: imò idem Hieronymus in epistolam ad Pammachium huius epistolæ mentionem facit. *Vasq. quo supra. It is found in the epistle of S. Hierom, ad Ioh. Hierosol.*

hath

hath this part in it concerning the Image [*when I was at Anablatha*] Which is euident to them who will read the Epistle of S. *Hierome* to *Iohn* Bishop of *Ierusalem*: yet doth Senensis instance in the authority of [14] *Damascene* to proue this Epistle a forged deuice: but *Damascene is falsly alleged*, saith Vasques: adding that [15] *This our common refuge, in excepting against the Epistle as counterfet is no way allowable.* Hitherto they haue deliuered no Answer sufficient. Wee maruell why their great Iesuite *Valentia* hath beene so long silent: therefore he, [16] *If it shall appeare that it was the proper Epistle of Epiphanius, yet wee answer that the Church is of greater authority with vs than Epiphanius.* Whereunto we oppose that which *Epiphanius* preferred before any pretence of the Church, when hee said that the abuse of that image was [17] *contrary to Scriptures.*

[14] Cum verò Damascenus dicit (*id quod Bellar. obijcit supra*) Epistolã Epiphanij esse confictã: [15] Non de hac Epistola ad Iohannem Hierosol. (vt falsò Senensis autumat) sed de epist. ad Theodosium intelligit. Ergò hoc commune & frequens nostrorum effugium mihi non placet, & Hieronymo necesse non fuit in epistola sua ad Pammachium huius veli meminisse, quia Hieronymi institutum erat tantùm de Iohannis Hierosol. erroribus agere. *Vasquez ibid.* [16] Aut si maximè exploratum sit eam epistolam esse genuinam, respondemus, apud nos Ecclesiæ authoritas plus ponderis habet. *Greg. Valent. Iesu. l. 2. de Idol. c. 7. pag. 719.* Vna hirundo non facit ver. *Anglo-Rhemens. transl. in non. Test. vide Indicium de Imaginibus.* [17] Cùm vidissem (inquit Epiphanius) contra authoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, &c. *Epiphan. vt est ab isto citatus.*

65 In all that hath beene spoken we see many falshoods, and that in a part of but one controuersie. If *P. R.* shall desire 500. of this kinde, I binde my selfe vnto him by a faithfull protestation in a Moneths warning to satisfie him, whensoeuer hee or any for him shall exact it. Neither shall I need to borrow oile for this lampe to make it manifest vnto the world, that in all their passages in all controuersies of greatest moment when they are to be discussed by Scriptures, Fathers, and reasons, there are such crossings, thwartings and contradictions among them, as though (as the Poet faineth) the teeth of the Dragon were fallen out of his mouth and metamorphosed into armed men, presently bent to kill one another. But I will come one step neerer to *P. R.* his demand, Offering him

A Satisfaction to his first demand in a particular instance of a noble Falsificator on his side.

§ 15.

66 P. *R.* requireth an example of *Any one*, who hath been found so grosly false, that in the eie of man hee may not be acquitted either by *Ignorance* of *translation*, &c. Which demand if it proceed from vnfeinednesse, it seemeth vnto mee so intolerably reasonable, that now I am driuen to a twofold trouble in yeelding satisfaction; the one is that I know not with what *one* to begin first, the falsificators be so many: the second is, when I shal begin with any choice one, how to make an end, so manifold are their falsifications. Therfore in respect of the falsifiers I would require of *P. R.* to propound vnto mee any one of his Doctours, in whom hee hath best assurance of integritie, whether *Greg. de Valentia*, *Stapleton*, *Bellarmine*, *Coccius*, *Suarez*, *Turrian*, *Campian*, *Gretzer*, *Fuerdentius*, the *Remish Translat.* in their *Annotations*: or any, I say, of those which haue beene publikely authorised of their Church, and I will not doubt but to giue him thrice three examples of their fraud. In the meane time I thinke it requisite to single out of all such an one as is commended of all: to wit, *Cardinall Bellarmine*, that *P. R.* may not repine, saying: hee hath chosen a *Dauid* the least in his fathers house: but confesse that I haue preferred a *Saul*, one higher by the head and shoulders than any of the rest: not a dead man, who cannot interpret his own meaning, whether he had falsified vpon *ignorance*, *negligence*, *&c.* but one, which now liuing is able to answer for himselfe, whose credit *P. R.* doth tender, and with whom he may consult to know whether I do him iniury or no. Now to the point.

First, examples of such kinde of falsifyes in wilfull slanders, whereof Cardinall Bellarmine *hath beene guilty, as will appeare euen by the euidence of his owne confession.*

67 Let *P. R.* for a while take Cardinall *Bellarmine* into secret

confession

confession, and first aske him with what conscience hee hath charged *Caluin* with the heresie of the [1] *Pelagians, who denied that there was any originall sinne in infants, especially in the children of faithfull Christians?* For as hee could not bee ignorant [2] *That this doctrine of denying originall sinne was* (as their owne L. Iesuite confesseth) *the proper heresie of the Pelagians.* And not so only, but saith furthermore that [3] *Caluin and all other Protestants are so far from denying originall sinne, that they doe monstrously extend the nature thereof euen vnto persons regenerat.* I let passe a dozen such criminations cast by him vpon Protestants, which by the testimonies of his owne Doctors may be prooued to haue beene lewd and intolerable slanders. I insist now only vpon such his confessions, whereby it may appeare he hath been, in his iniuries against his Aduersaries, the greatest Aduersary to his owne conscience.

68 First he maketh Protestants guilty of the heresie of [4] *The Nouatians, in taking from the Church all power of reconciling men vnto God.* When as his own Authors note that, [5] *The heresie of the Nouatians was this, viz. to deny any man, who should sin after baptisme, all hope of remission of sins, although he should repent.* Yea and also *Bellarmine* himself in behalfe of Protestants confesseth else-where that [6] *They require repentance and faith in Christi-*

[1] Pelagiani docebant non esse in hominibus peccatum originale, & præcipuè in filijs fidelium. Idem docent Caluinus & Bucerus, &c. *Bellar. lib. 4. de Eccl. milit. c. 9. §. Pelagiani.*

[2] Hic proprius erat Pelagianorum error, negare peccatum originale esse hæreditariam naturę nostrę cotruptionē. *Greg. Val. Ies. lib. De orig. pec. c. 2. in initio.*

[3] Caluinus & Lutherus, cæteriq; Protestantes adeò non negârunt originale peccatum, vt illud prodigiosis loquendi modis exagitanc, etiam in renatis manere dicunt, &c. *Idem Ib. cap. 8. & in Tom. 2. disp. 6. q. 11. punct. 1. §.* Quam quæstionem. [4] Nouatianorum error præcipuus erat, non esse in Ecclesia potestatem reconciliandi homines, nisi per baptismum: Postea etiam addiderunt, non debere baptizatos inungi chrismate ab Episcopis. Caluinus negat vllum esse Sacramentum pœnitentiæ præter Baptisma, Lutherus Pœnitentiam reijcit. *Bellar. l. 4. De not. Eccle. cap. 9. §.* Nouatianorum. [5] Nouatianorum hæresis peccantibus omnem pœnitentiæ virtutem tollit, dicens eos, qui semel post Baptismum lapsi sunt, nunquam postea consequi remissionem peccatorum, etiamsi eos pœniteat. *Alphon. De castro. lib. 12. hæres. 3. tit.* Pœnitentia. Omne peccatum lethale post Baptismum commissum irremissibile censuerunt. *Vega. l. 13. de Iustif. c. 2. pag. 486.* In Ioh. 5. 4. Dixit Christus, Noli amplius peccare, nè deterius aliquid tibi contingat. Ex quo loco probat Pacianus contra Nouatianos, non negandam esse pœnitentibus veniam, nec enim dixisse Christum iam noli peccare, quia non sanaberis iterùm, sed, nè deterius aliquid tibi contingat. *Maldonat. Ies. Comm. in eum locum Ioh.* [6] Dicunt Protestantes in Christianis post Baptismum requiri fidem & pœnitentiam, vt iustificentur & remissionem consequantur. *Bellar. lib. 3. de Iustif. cap. 6. & sæpè alias.*

ans,

ans, that they may be iustified and obtaine remission of sinnes. Nor this only, but [7] *There is no difference betweene vs* (saith he) *and Protestants about repentance as it is a conuersion vnto God with detestation of sin, or as it consisteth in outward signes of sorrow, weeping, confession, and outward chastisements, yea and almost all of them allow an outward rite of absolution. But the only controuersie betweene vs is, whether Penance bee properly a Sacrament.* The contradiction is this, to impute vnto Protestants an heresie which taketh away all maner of *Repentance* and hope of *remission for sin past*, and yet to acknowledge in them a contrary orthodoxall truth, which is, to professe a necessity of *Repentance, and reconciliation and remission of sinnes.*

69 Againe, he attributeth vnto *Caluin* the heresie of the *Manicheis*, [8] *Who* (saith he) *did condemne the nature of men, depriuing them of freewill, and ascribing the originall and beginning of sin vnto the nature of man, and not vnto his freewill.* Seeing hee hath himselfe obserued that, [9] *Caluine teacheth that man in his first creation had freewill, whereby in his integrity he might, if hee would, haue attained vnto eternall life.* This contradiction in this point is no more than this, to charge *Caluin* with that which he did not beleeue. Is not this singular falshood? and yet behold a more notable than this.

70 He accuseth M. *Bullinger* of [10] *Arianisme*, becauſe of this sentence [*Tres sunt, non statu sed gradu, &c.*] Notwithstanding hee knew this was the very sentence of [11] *Tertullian.* And is

1 Non de quauis pœnitentia inter nos & Protestantes controuersia habetur, potest enim vera pœnitentia vel in solamentis conuersione, atq; interna peccati detestatione consistere, vel in externis signis, vt mœrore, lachrymis, confessione, corporis afflictatione se prodere, neq; de hac re vlla est controuersia. Ipsi aduersarij Caluinus & Chémnitius opera externa laboriosa, vt signa

veræ pœnitentiæ internæ non reijciunt. Deindè absolutionis ritum aliquem fere omnes agnoscunt. Sed hic est status controuersiæ, vtrùm pœnitentia signis externis manifestata, accedente ad eam verbo absolutionis, sit Sacramentum propriè dictum. *Bellar. lib. 1. de Pœnit. cap. 8. §. Vt igitur.* [8] Manichæorum est (inquit Hieronym.) hominum damnare naturam, & hominum auferre arbitrium, & peccatorum originem non tribuunt Manichæi libero arbitrio, inquit Augustinus. Idem Caluinus. *Bellar. l. 4. de Not. Eccles. cap. 9. §. 8. Manichæorum.* [9] Iohannes Caluinus docet quòd in initio homo habuerit liberum arbitrium, nunc non habet. In hac integritate (inquit) libero pollebat homo arbitrio, quo, si vellet, adipisci posset vitam æternam. *Bellar. l. 1. de grat. primi hominis. §.* in eodem principio. [10] Henricum Bullingerum non puduit scribere tres esse in diuinitate personas non statu sed gradu, non substantiâ sed formâ, non potestate sed specie differentes. Certè personas gradu, formâ, specie differentes, vix Ariani ipsi dicere ausi essent. *Bellar. præf. in Contro. de Christo. §.* Henricum. [11] Sic scribit Tertullianus in libro aduersus Praxeam, Tres sunt non statu sed gradu, non substantiâ sed formâ, non pote-

therefore

therefore elſe-where expounded as orthodoxall and iuſtifiable by [12] himſelfe.

71 Though *P.R.* require but three examples of falſhood, yet may I not enuie him a further choice, becauſe I know not the curioſitie of his palate. Therefore let him againe conſult with Cardinall *Bellar.* in another taxation of Proteſtants, ſaying in one place that, [13] *They teach that the ſoules of faithfull men departing this life doe not goe directly vnto heauen.* In another place he himſelfe together with his fellow Ieſuite haue publikely recorded that it is a common [14] *Obiection of Proteſtants prooving from Scriptures againſt the doctrine of Purgatory, that the ſoules of the faithfull preſently after death goe directly vnto heauen.*

72 He reſteth not heere, but once againe challengeth [15] *Caluine for* (as he calleth it) *an ancient hereſie alleged by Theodoret, affirming, that there is only a figure of Chriſts body in the Euchariſt.* And yet in another place affirming both [16] *That that opinion is not ancient, nor yet now to be found in Theodoret*, and alſo that; [17] *The foreſaid doctrine of Caluine doth teach that in the Chriſtian ſoule departing this life*) non ad Deum ibat, ſed ad inferos, aut alium locum extra cœlũ, vbi non magis Deus eſt, quàm hic nobiſcum. *Bellar. l. 1. de Beat Sanct. cap. 4. paulo poſt initium.* [14] Octaua obiectio (*anſwering to the obiection of Proteſtants*) ſumitur ex 2. Cor. 5. [Si domus terrena noſtræ habitationis diſſoluitur, habemus domum non manufactam in cœlis] rectâ igitur poſt mortem ſinè Purgatorio pij homines transferuntur in cœlum. Reſpondeo &c. *Bellar. l. 1. de Imag. c. 8. §.* Octaua obiectio. *And* Obijciunt nobis Proteſtantes loca Scripturarum & Patrum, in quibus duplex ſtatus eorum, qui moriuntur, ſignificatur, impiorum in ſupplicium æternum, & iuſtorum in vitam æternam. Deinde huiuſmodi loca Scripturarum vrgent, quibus determinatè ſignificari videtur, eos qui ex hac vita diſcedunt in ſtatu gratiæ ſtatim recipi ad beatitudinem. vt Apoc. 14. Beati qui moriuntur in Domino, requieſcunt à laboribus: Si (inquiunt) omnes beati, tùm nulli in Purgatorij cruciatibus continentur. *Greg. Valent. de Purg. c. 8. and the Rhemiſh Annot. in Apoc.* 14. 13. [15] Quidam antiqui hæretici fuerunt, qui negabant Euchariſtiam eſſe veram carnem Chriſti, & tantùm eſſe volebant ſignum & imaginem corporis Chriſti. Hanc hæreſin refert Theodoretus, eandem docent hoc tempore Zuinglius, Caluines. *Bellar. l. 4. de not. Eccl. c. 9. ad finem.* [16] Quæ ſententia citatur à Theodoreto in Dialogo, vbi tamen nunc non habetur. Sed nè glorientur Caluiniſtæ ſententiam ſuam valdè antiquam eſſe, illud eſt obſeruandum, antiquiſſimos illos hæreticos non tàm ſacramentum Euchariſtiæ, quàm myſterium incarnationis oppugnâſſe. *Bellar. l. 1. de Euchar. c. 1. in initio.* [17] Docet Caluinus ſymbola & corpus Chriſti, licèt inter ſe loco plurimùm diſtent, tamen coniuncta eſſe non ſolùm ratione ſigni, quia vnum eſt ſignum alterius, ſed etiam quia vnà cùm ſigno Deus exhibet verum Chriſti corpus & ſanguinem, quo animæ noſtræ alantur ad vitam æternam. *Bellar. ib. §.* Secundò docet.

ſtate ſed ſpecie. *Greg. Val. Jeſ. lib. de vnit. & Trinit. c. 9.*

[12] Tertullianus in libro aduerſus Praxeam cùm dixit filium diſtingui à Patre non ſtatu ied gradu, per gradum intelligit ordinem perſonarum. *Bellar. l. 1. de Chriſto, c. 10. §.* Reſpondeo ſecundum.

[13] Secundùm errorem Caluiniſtarum (*ſpeaking of a Chriſtian ſoule departing this life*)

Eucharist there is to be exhibited vnto the faithfull not only a signe of Christs body, but also the body and blood it selfe by which mens soules are nourished vnto eternall life. Or as another Iesuit testifieth for Caluine, [18] *That our soules communicate with the body of Christ substantially.* Heere is no more oddes in this accusation, than ancient and not ancient, heresie and not heresie. All these contradictions do certainly euince that he hath by publike imputations slandered those, whom in his conscience hee did acquit. And shall we thinke that his conscience could bee sincere in alleging other mens testimonies and witnesses, who is found thus perfidiously vniust in exhibiting his owne? I spare to produce multitudes of this kind which I haue in store, and will be a debter to *P. R.* for many of this sort, ready to pay my debt as soone as this my promise shall be exacted.

[18] Docet Caluinus corpus Christi ab animis nostris in Eucharistia substantialiter communicari. *Greg. Valent. Iesuit. tom. 4. disp. 6. q. 3. punct. 1. §. Item.*

Some examples of Cardinall Bellarmine *his falsifications in the allegation of testimonies.*

§ 16.

SAint Cyprian saith, [1] *Whence is this tradition? is it deriued from the Lords authority, or from the precept of the Apostles? For God willeth that we should do those things which are written.* From whence Protestants conclude, that the Scriptures are of sufficiencie for our direction in all questions of faith. Bellarmine answereth, that [2] *Cyprian spoke this when he thought to defend an error, and therefore it is no maruell if hee erred in so reasoning, for the which cause S. Augustine* (saith hee) *did worthily refute him.* The question is not what errour *Cyprian* held, but whether his maner of reasoning frō the sufficiency of scripture were erroneous, or no. Bellar. pretendeth that S. *Augustine* did *worthily reproone him.* But whosoeuer shall consult with S. *Augustine* in the chap. specified, shall find that this point by

[1] *Cyprianus epist. 10. ad Pomp.* Vnde est hæc traditio? an ex dominica autoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis & epistolis? ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt testatur Deus. *Hesronuus Bellarmine.*

[2] Respondeo, Cyprianum hæc scripsisse cum errorem suum tueri vellet, & ideo non mirum si more errantium tunc ratiocinaretur. Quare Augustinus contra Donatistas cap. 23. & sequentibus hanc epistolam meritò refellit. *Bellar. lib. 4. de verb. Dei, cap. 11. §.* profert Cyprian. &c.

him

him is excellently commended, [3] *That Cyprian warneth vs* (saith S. Auguſt.) *to run vnto the fountaine, that is, vnto the tradition of the Apoſtles; from thence to deriue a conduit to our times, it is chiefly good and doubtleſſe to be performed.*

74 Secondly, Bellarmine to eſtabliſh the authority of the Pope, doth giue this prerogatiue to S. *Peter*, to wit: [4] *That S. Peter was the only Biſhop, and that other Apoſtles tooke their orders from him*: which he laboureth to euince from the teſtimonies of *Anacletus, Clemens Alexand. Euſebius*, and *Cyprian*; wherein he is refelled by his own Doctours. One ſaying, that [5] *Indeed thoſe Fathers meane no ſuch thing*: Another, that [6] *The Epiſtles of Anacletus are counterfet, which many vrge more than is meet to the end they may aduance the authority of the ſea of Rome.*

75 Againe, where Bellarmine citeth the teſtimony of [7] *Platina for the commendation of Pope Hildebrand*: And in another place finding *Platina* obiected in the queſtion of confeſſion, anſwereth for the diſabling of the Author, ſaying, [8] that *Platina had no publike authority to pen the liues of the Popes from publike records.* Which is notably falſe, *Platina* himſelfe in his epiſtle Dedicatory vnto the then Pope writing thus: [9] *Thou (o Prince of Diuines, and chiefe of Biſhops) haſt commanded mee to write the liues of the Popes*: whoſe hiſtory is therfore great-

[3] Quod Cyprianus monet vt ad fontem recurramus, id eſt, Apoſtolorum traditionem, & indè in noſtra tempora canalem dirigamus, optimum eſt, & ſine dubitatione faciendũ. Traditum eſt igitur ab Apoſtolis quòd ſit vnus Deus, vnum Baptiſma, vna fides, Epheſ. 4. *Auguſt. lib. 5. de Baptiſmo cap. 26.*

[4] Vigeſima ſecunda prærogatiua Petri eſt, quod ſolus Petrus Epiſcopus ordinatus fuerit: cæteri autem à Petro. Probatur ex Anacleto Epiſt. 1. In nouo Teſtamento &c. à Clemente Alexandrino, à Cypriano lib. 4. Epiſt. à Leone Sermone 3. de aſſumptione ſua ad Pontificatum &c. *Bellarm. lib. 1. de Pontif. Rom. cap. 23.*

[5] Nonnulli contendunt cæteros Apoſtolos eam poteſtatem iuriſdictionis accepiſſe, idq; probare conantur ex authoritate Anacleti, Cypriani, Auguſtini, Leonis, Clementis Alexandrini. Sed reuera non faciunt id quod iſtius ſententiæ autores volunt. *Franciſcus de victoria relect. 2. concluſ. 1. §. quod.* [6] De epiſtola pontificum Clementis & Anacleti, multa ſunt quæ manifeſte oſtendunt illas eſſe ſuppoſititias, quibus nituntur ij, qui plus quàm expedit Sedis Romanæ authoritatem amplificant. *Cardinal. Cuſanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 3. cap. 2.* [7] Extat apud Platinam forma electionis Hildebrandi in hæc verba: Nos ſanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ &c. *Bellarm. lib. 4. de Roman. Pontif. cap. 13. §. Extat, &c.*

[8] *Being vrged with his teſtimonie in the caſe of Romiſh Confeſſion, by the Decree of Innocentius, he anſwereth*: Sed neque Platina publica authoritate & ex publicis archiuis vitas illas Pontificum ſcripſit. *Bellarm. lib. 3. De Pœnit. cap. 13. §. Sed neque.* [9] Tu Theologorum Princeps (maxime Pontifex) non fruſtrà mandâſti vt res geſtas Pontificum ſcriberem. *Platina in Præfat. operis.*

ly commended by *Balbus*, as being [10] *True, and taken out of publike monuments*. I could furniſh *P. R.* with infinite ſuch like deluſions, and will alſo whenſoeuer my Aduerſary ſhall renew his demand: for ſuch a multitude of examples I could bring, that I finde it a greater difficulty for me to ſubtract, than to multiplie.

75 Therefore I will now confine my ſelfe within the precincts of but one onely controuerſie concerning Purgatory: where *Bellarmine* diſtinguiſhing of the diuers acception of the word *fire* in the writings of ancient Fathers, concludeth that, [11] *When the Fathers ſpeake of the fire of the day of doome*, when all the world ſhall be of a flame, *they meane not Purgatory fire*, which ſoules ſuffer immediately after death. After this hee allegeth [12] *Moſt plaine places*, (as hee calleth them) *out of the Fathers* for proofe of Purgatory. Amongſt others (in his firſt booke *de Purgatorio*) S. [13] Ambroſe *ſerm.* 20. *in Pſal.* 118. for proofe of *Purgatory fire*: which hee himſelfe confeſſeth in his next booke [14] *not to be meant of Purgatory*. So he dealeth alſo with S. [15] *Hilary*, vrging his ſentence vpon the *Pſalm.* 118. as an euident place for *Purgatory*, which by his owne iudgement [16] *Seemeth not to ſignifie Purgatory*. And yet againe, a-

[10] Quæ Platina de vitis Pontificum ſcripſit vera ſunt exiſtimanda, quippe cum ea ex publicis tabulis ſcripſit, aliiſq; legitimis documentis deprompſit: in quibus res geſtæ Pontificum hiſtorica fide continentur. *Hieron Balbus de coronatione.* §. Poſt mortem Conſtantini, &c.

[11] Vocatur purgatorium locus quidã, in quo, tanquam in carcere, poſt hanc vitam purganturanimæ, quæ in hac plenè purgatæ non fuerant. De hac eſt tota controuerſia. *Bellar. lib.* 1 *de purgat. cap.* 1. § vocatur. Patres aliqui per ignem non intelligunt ignem purgatorij, ſed ignem diuini iudicij, quomodo loquitur Paulus in 1. Cor. 3. cùm ait, vniuſcuiuſq; opus quale ſit ignis probabit. *Bellar. lib.* 2. *de purgat. cap.* 1. §. Adde. Apoſtolus 1. Cor. 3. Ignis probabit] loquitur de igne ſeueri & iuſti iudicij Dei, qui non eſt ignis purgans & affligens, ſed probans & examinans. *Bellar. li.* 1. *de purg. cap.* 4. §. Supereſt. [12] Sunt apertiſſima loca ex patribus, vbi aſſeritur purgatorium, quorum pauca quædam afferam. *Bellar. lib.* 1. *de purgat. cap.* 6. §. Denide &c. [13] Vide Ambroſium Serm. 20. in Pſal. 118. *Ibidem*, §. Ambroſius &c. Is in Pſal. 118. Serm. 20. Omnes, inquit, oportet tranſire per flammas, ſiue Ioannes ſit ſiue Petrus &c. *Bellar. lib.* 2. *de purgat. cap.* 1. §. Ambroſius. *Et paulò poſt* [14] Ambroſius hoc poſteriore loco (*ſpeaking of the Pſal.* 118) videtur per ignem non intelligere purgatorium. *Bellar. ibid.* §. Adde &c. *He vrgeth* Hilary [15] Inter apertiſſima loca. Hilarius in Pſal. 118. illud [concupiuit anima mea deſiderare iudicia tua] nobis (inquit) eſt ille ignis obeundus in quo ſubeunda ſunt grauia illa expiandæ à peccatis animæ ſuppliciа. *Bellar. li.* 1. *de purga. ca.* 7. §. Hilarius. *Rurſus* [16] Hilarius in Pſal. 118. in illa verba: Concupiuit anima &c. vbi inſinuat B. Mariam tranſire debuiſſe per illum ignem. *Bellar. lib.* 2. *de purgat. cap.* 1. §. Idem videtur: *Rurſus.* Aliqui (*amongſt whom he citeth Hilarie*) videntur non intelligere ignem purgatorium vt (*anſwering to the place aboue mentioned*) Hilarius. *Ibid.* §. Adde.

mong

mong his [17] *manifest places* of the Fathers for Purgatory, hee allegeth the testimonies of [18] *Origen*, [19] *Basil*, [20] *Lactantius*, [21] *Hierom*, [22] *Ambrose*: all which are acknowledged expressly by [23] *Sixtus Senensis*, from the euidence of the contexts to haue spoken only of the fire of the day of iudgement, and consequently as [24] *Bellarmine* hath taught vs; *not of the fire of Purgatory*. Lastly he professeth to confirme the doctrine of purgatory out of most of the [25] *Greeke and Latine Fathers*. And another Iesuite saith more largely [26] *of all the Greeke Fathers*: which is an assertion as false, as peremptory, euen by the confession of their owne Bishop saying: [27] *That there is very rare mention of Purgatory in the Greeke Fathers; and that the Latine Fathers did not all at first apprehend the doctrine thereof.*

[17] Sunt apertissima loca in patribus. *Bella. lib. 1. de purgat. cap. 6. §. Deinde sunt. Paulo post.*

[18] Vt Origenes homil. 6. in Exod. Saluus fit si quid forte plumbi habent admixtum.

[19] Et Basilius in Isa. 9. quod depascatur & deuoret ignis purgatorius. [20] Et Lactantius lib. 7. cap. 21. perstringentur igne atque comburentur. [21] Et Hieronymus in fine Comment. in Isaiam: quorum opera in igne probanda. [22] Ambrosius in Psalm. 36. Non exuremur, tamen vremur, &c. *Hæc omnia Bellar. lib. 1. de purga. cap. 6.* [23] Origenes dixit; Omnes homines, excepto Christo, aliquo modo vrendos esse igne conflagrationis diuini iudicij. Et Hilarius vnà cum Ambrosio Origenem sequutus est. Eodem pertinere videntur quæ Basilius annotauit: ad eandem opinionem apparet alluisse Hieronymum, & longe antè Hieronymum quoque Lactantium. *Sixtus Senensis Bibliothe. lib. 5. annot. 171.* Lactantius lib. 7. cap. 21. perstringentur inquit &c. loquitur de iis qui in resurrectione sunt igni tradendi. *Suarez Iesuita in part. 3. Thom. qu 59. art. 6. disp. 57. sect. 1. §.* Ambrosius in Comment. in Psal. 36. consentire videtur cum Origene qui dicit omnes homines, Christo excepto, probandos esse & aliquo modo vrendos igne conflagrationis diuini iudicij. *Sixtus Senens. Bibliothe. lib. 5. annot. 171.* [24] *See afore numb. 12.* [25] Purgatorium ex Patribus Græcis & Latinis probamus. *Bellar. lib. 1. de purgat. cap 6.* [26] Omnes veteres Græci Patres agnouerunt purgatorium & Scriptis suis luculentissimè prodiderunt. *Salmeron Jesuit. Comm. in 1. Cor. 15. disp. 25. in fine.* [27] Legat qui velit Græcorum veterum Commentarios, & nullum, quantum opinor, aut ratissimum de purgatorio sermonem inueniet: Sed neque Latini simul omnes huius rei veritatem conceperunt. *Raffens. art. 18. aduers. Lutherum.*

77 If any shall but obserue in this one controuersie the number of witnesses brought in for the confirmation of this their new Article in the name of ancient Fathers, which are by confession of our Aduersaries meerely counterfet. as *Clemens his Constitutions, Clemens Epistles, Athanas. in quæst. Eusebius Emissenus, Iosephus Ben Gorion, Hieron. in Prouerb. August. ad fratres in Eremo, the Liturgies of Iames and others*: All which as they are vrged for proofe of Purgatory, so are they reiected

by their own men (I desire to be challenged for proofe heerof) as *forged*, or *corrupted*, or *Apocrypha*; and indeed no better witnesses for truth, than the Knights of the post bee fit men for a Iury. If further he shall mark how true Fathers and Scriptures are instanced in for proofe of the same Article, whereof (when I speake of Fathers) most of them (when I speake of Canonicall scriptures) all of them are found by the iudgement of their owne Doctors to be tortured, wrested, and forced, as it were, to say that which they neuer meant. If he, lastly, consider how almost euery one of them indeuouring the defence of the same doctrine is in his owne assertions contradicted by himselfe, which may be in this one controuersie concerning *Purgatory*, a late Article of their faith, most plainly discerned.

78 These obseruations may giue our Reader such a scantling of their dealing, that we may iustly pronounce *P. R.* his censure vpon themselues, *Not to be beleeued heereafter*. So desperate hath his demand beene, when he required any one ouertaken in a *triple falsitie*, as though he would venture all the credit of all the *Annotations vpon the Remish Testament*, all the volumes of *Baronius* his *Annales*, all the monuments of Councels in their *Binius* and *Surius*, all the disputes of *Bellarmine*, of *Greg. de Valentia*, of *Coccius*, and all other their late Doctors, vpon (as I may so call it) only tray trippe, *a triple falsitie, and then neuer to be credited againe*. I am perswaded that no Protestant, who hath beene conuersant in reading and examining their Authors, but he will stand astonished to heare this grant our *Mitigator* maketh, as being (as I haue said) intolerably disaduantagious vnto the Romish part: but he will easily cease to maruell when he perceiueth by whom it is made, to wit, *P. R.* the Authour of the booke of *Mitigation*, who himselfe is guilty of thrice three palpable falsities, so that none shall heerafter need to wonder why hee hath beene so lauish in hazzarding other mens credits, seeing he is so desperately prodigall of his owne. Let vs draw neere vnto him to shew this, for hee calleth vs vnto him.

A Satisfaction vnto P. R. his second demaund concerning himselfe, in the discouerie of his owne notorious falshoods, inforcing him by vertue of his owne promise neuer hereafter to credit himselfe.

§ 17.

79 P. R. amongst others is bold to insert himselfe: [a] *If any* (saith he) *hath set down in Print any such falsity, so that it must needes bee presumed that hee knew the vntruth, and yet would set it foorth: I will in my conscience greatly discredit that Author, whether it be another or my selfe, if two or three such falsities may be shewen.* So he.

[a] Pref. to the Reader pa.28.num. 25.

Our *Mitigator* would seeme to haue a conscience, and so I doubt not but he hath; but so miserable, as (if it be lawfull to iudge by probabilities) it were a kind of happinesse for him to haue no conscience at all. Let our Reader witnesse betweene mee and him according to the euidence of testimonies which shall bee brought against him; most of them shall bee so apparent, that any one vnderstanding English may presently discerne them. I will not vrge him with his own contradiction, who in his preface to his Reader saith, [b] *I returne to the Treatise of T. M. for more of his name we cannot yet find out.* And yet had in his *Epistle Dedicatorie vnto both the Vniuersities*, which is set before the Preface, mentioned *T. M.* in his expresse name *Thomas Morton*, fiue seuerall times. But this fault were very pardonable, were it not in him who will thinke no fault pardonable in his aduersary: neuertheless I hold it excusable by the vertue of this common Prouerbe: *Cart before the Horse*, as we say. I therefore note not this for a falsity, because a lie is onely then, when the tongue or pen goeth *against* the mind and wit of the speaker or writer. But in this contradiction I thinke rather that *P. R.* his pen runne *before* his wit, and so will hee excuse himselfe, except hee had rather bee accounted

[b] Pref. to the Reader num. 25. pag. 28.

[c] Epist. Ded. num.5. & nū. 25. and again, num. 25. and num.28.

counted lyingly witty, than witlesly rash. Other such like stumblings I ouerpasse. I come to note such his falles, as may seeme to bee recouerable by no excuse.

One falshood of P.R.

[a] See aboue §.3. num.6. 7.8. &c.

80 Let that be first which I [a] haue already mentioned, where peremptorily he affirmed that the *Clause of reseruation* was *not* by me *set downe in Latine throughout my whole Treatise against Æquinocation aboue once:* whereto the Reader may answer for me that it is set downe in Latine aboue twenty times. What excuse can he pretend? *ignorance, ouersight, negligence?* why, the booke was present before his eies, euen in those places which he particularly discussed. Could that errour be by *errour of Print, diuersitie of translation, or difference of Editions?* (for these are all the pretences which he will allow) not one of all these (he knoweth) can redeeme him from guilt: and therfore I may pronounce against him in his own words: *He must needs be presumed to haue known the vntruth* of his assertion, *and yet would set it foorth.* And therefore by this *one example* may learne hereafter *to mistrust himselfe.*

A Second falshood.

81 Where I writ of my Aduersary the *Moderate Answerer* thus: [b] *He* (say I) *wilfully seating himselfe in the chaire of those Doctours, whom the Apostle describeth, saying* [*They will be Doctors, and yet vnderstand not what they say, nor whereof they affirme.*] By which particle, [*He,*] euen the vulgar Reader may vnderstand that I described but one, which was, my Aduersarie the *Moderate Answerer*, who vsed to satisfie obiected testimonies, saying: *If this be these mens opinions*, and neuer inquired what their opinions were. Therfore I iudged him to be a Doctor of that *chaire* signified by the Apostle: where the Doctour faith, *he knoweth not what.* This my application vnto only that one, our *P.R.* setteth on his owne tenters, and stretcheth it vnto all, saying, [c] *But whether this description of fond presumptuous Doctors doth agree vnto our Catholike Priests or to Protestants, will appeare, &c.* And againe, *Now let vs see*

[b] Full satisfaction Epist. to the seduced brethren.

[c] Treatis. *Mitigat.* Epist. Dedic. num. 23.

how

how he goeth about to proone our Priests such bad Doctours, &c. Which he did to make me seeme so presumptuous, as to think all Romish Doctors vnlearned, which had been (I confesse) an odious presumption. Let them be as greatly learned as they are, or else as they would seeme to bee, yet must there be a *con*, I meane an heart zealous of the truth, to be ioined with *science* to make vp a perfect *conscience*, which is the true Doctour indeed: otherwise wee know, that [8] *The Serpent* by being *the most subtile of all the beasts in the field*, will deserue no better commendation, than to be accounted the skilfullest *Seducer*. Of which kind *P. R.* will prooue himselfe to be; for what excuse may he now vse to free himselfe from falshood? *Editions? Translations? Prints?* Heere is only one Edition, and that only in English. Will he say, that it was an error of *ignorance, ouersight, negligence?* So might some peraduenture iudge of it, who doe not obserue that hee is euery-where ouer-diligent to draw vpon me an imputation of *arrogancy and malice.*

[8] Gen. 3. 1.

A Third falshood.

82 Where the *Moderate Answerer*, to proue the doctrine of Protestants rebellious, obiected vnto mee the positions of *Goodman*, I made this answer, [h] *If I should iustifie Goodman, although your examples might excuse him, my heart should condemn my selfe.* Signifying, that although *Goodman* were graceless in his conclusions, yet compared with the heinous practises of Romish Priests, might (but as *Tyre* and *Sydon* in respect of *Capernaum* and *Bethsaida*, that is, as the lesse sinner in respect of the greater) be thought excusable. And I added also heerunto these words, *Let vs leaue Goodman as a man who by his false and wicked positions hath falsified his name.* Yet *P. R.* aduenture to say thus; [i] *Hee* (meaning *Tho. Morton*) *doth particularly iustifie Goodman.* What falsitie shall we call this, where an accusation is laid against mee for *iustifying* that man, whose positions I call *false and wicked*; whose person I hold *vnworthy of the name of a good man*; whom, I say, *I cannot iustifie without condemnation of mine owne soule?* What excuse now shall *P. R.* make? shall it be *edition, print, translation?* there is

[h] See *Full satisfact.* Part. 2. chap. 3. pag. 103.

[i] Treatise of *Mitig.* cap 3. num. 14. pag. 100.

no difference in these kindes. Was it *negligence* or *ignorance*? the words are plaine and all in English. Wherfore if my speech concerning *Goodman* bee a iustification, then may not *P. R.* be offended to be iustified by me in like terms, thus: *If I should iustifie P. R.* his accusations, or thinke that he writ with a good conscience (although the example of some libelling spirit might excuse him in this kind,) my heart *should condemne my selfe*: and therefore I passe him ouer as one who is not worthy of any name, except *P. R.* which may signifie *Perfidiæ Reus*, that is, a man guilty of perfidiousnesse, his positions are so rebellious, and his accusations so false and calumnious. Whereof he will giue vs many examples.

A Fourth falshood.

83 The *Moderate Answerer* obiected also the examples of *Knox* and *Buchanan* as Doctors and Actors of the rebellion in *Scotland*. My Answer was, that [k] *Their seditious doctrine was condemned in Scotland*, noting them to haue beene worthy of all condemnation. Neuertheless *P. R.* doth obiect, that [l] *He* (meaning *Tho. Morton*) *taketh vpon him a iustification of all Protestants for rebelling against their Princes in any Countrey whatsoeuer, but more particularly some in England, and others as Knox and Buchanan, and the like Ministers in Scotland, turning vpside downe the States against their Soueraignes.* This is no more, than if an Italian obiecting vnto mee that wee haue theeues in England, and I should answer, It is true we haue so: but yet so farre is theft from being tolerable in our State, that when theeues are catched, they are foorthwith condemned and hanged: and then the Italian should challenge mee that in thus answering I iustified theeues. The crimination of *P. R.* is altogether alike, and consequently he must needs *bee presumed to haue knowen the vntruth*, and to haue obiected this for the preiudice of my conscience, to the strangling of his owne.

[k] See *Full Satisfact.* Part. 2. cap. 4. pag. 107.

[l] Treatise of *Mitig.* cap. 3. num. 14. pag. 100.

A Fift falshood.

84 In my book of [m] *Satisfaction* I had this passage, concerning an obiection against some Protestants, answering, *Deny Christ*

[m] See *Full Satisfact.* Part. 1. chap. 7. pag. 20.

to be God? God forbid! but to be God of God onely in a particular sense, this indeed they doe. But can you finde no more Protestants of this opinion, (to wit, besides *M. Willet*, and *D. Fulke?*) *Your Iesuit reckoneth vp Caluin and Beza, and I thinke he saith truely. I would either he or you did as truly vnderstand them. But yet we wish to heare what your Doctors thinke of this Protestants opinion: your Campian calleth it* monstrous, &c. A little after I added; *This doctrine,* Doth (*in the iudgement of your famous Bellarmine*) seeme Catholicall: because they deny not the sonne to be from the father; but they deny the essence of the Godhead to haue any generation. Hence *P. R.* inferreth and inforceth thus: " *Thomas Morton saith that Bellarmine reckoneth vp Caluine and Beza to be of that opinion. And who would not thinke vpon this Assertion of T. M. but that Cardinall Bellarmine were contrary to himselfe, accusing Caluine, and yet iustifying his doctrine? You see how many sleights are vsed heere in deceiuing the Reader.* As though I had endeuored to make *Bellarmine* contrary to himselfe, when as against the Iesuit *Campian* accusing *Caluin* and *Beza*, I opposed *Bellarmine* the greatest champion among the Iesuites as to be contrary vnto the other for defense of *Caluins* doctrine: manifesting this difference of *Campian* and *Bellarmine*, in these distinct letters *r, s, t.* Yet this Falsificator to make me seeme to haue vsed sleights as falsly heerein to make *Bellarmine* seeme contrary to himselfe, hath with his owne nimble *sleight* confounded the different testimonies of *Campian* and *Bellarmine*, who were produced as contrary one to another. What excuse may be admitted in this place? *ignorance, negligence? &c.* Why *P. R.* looketh vpon the place, and vnderstandeth English: and yet falsly obiecteth a *sleight of deceiuing my hearer*, himselfe by a fine sleight abusing both me and the hearer. The only excuse (I feare) must be that hee beheld the place with a squint-eid malice, which can neuer rightly discerne the truth.

" Treatise *Mitig.* ca. 6. num. 53. & num. 54. pa. 230.

A Sixt falsitie of P. R.

85 Heere *P. R.* rangeth at large, saying, that " *Thomas Morton framed a second part of his book for iustification of Protest-*

" pag. 113.

yet in effect he confesseth all that his Aduersary opposeth. Let *P. R.* learne what this meaneth, *Litera occidit*, and then let him come to be tried by my Booke, and almost a childe may discerne that in this one obiection hee hath giuen his conscience many a mortall wound. *In effect confessed all that was opposed?* What is there almost of all that *was opposed by the* Mod. Answ. (excepting the examples of *Knox, Buchanan, Goodman, Munster*, which all I iustly condemned) which was not directlie confuted? for in the *part.* 2. of the *Full Satisfact. cap.* 1. it was produced out of *Bellarmine* to bee the generall doctrine of Protestants, that, *Spirituall men haue no authority to deprive Princes of their kingdomes.* In the *cap.* 5. is set downe the expresse doctrine of *Caluine* and *Beza*, condemning all rebellious doctrine. In the chapter 6. are produced two Romish Historians acquitting the Protestants in *France* from suspition of rebellion. In the *cap.* 10. the *Moderate Answerer* is prooued to be impudently false for alleging only dumbe Authors to make *Luther* guilty of the losse of *Rhodes* and *Hungarie*, which then fell into the paw of the *Turke*: where I, from their owne Historians, did euince that *Adrian* the Pope was chargeable for that great losse in Christendome, which was without any witnesse or coniecture obiected against *Luther* by that *Moderate Answerer*. In the *cap.* 11. my Aduersary would needs accuse *Luther* to bee of the same opinion with *Munster*, who raised horrible rebellions in *Germany*, which is so notorious a slander, that their owne Doctors (as I haue shewed) haue acquitted *Luther*, confessing that *Luther writ against those turbulent spirits, and taught all Christians to arme themselues against that rebellious crew, and to put them to death.* These and many such confutations I vsed against the *Moderate Answerer*, conuincing him of notorious ignorance and falshood. And can now *P. R.* call a Confutation a *Confession* without a grosse abuse of the confidence of his Reader, and his own conscience?

Many falsehoods in one.

A Seuenth falsitie.

9 Full Satisf. part. 2. cap. 1. pag. 107.

86 In the *Full Satisfact. part.* 2. *chap.* 5. the *Moderate Answerer* did obiect thus; *Caluine and Beza and the rest of that*

holy

holy Synod say, that the Kings and Queenes, their children, posterity, and all Magistrates must be put to death. And so euery Protestant must be more than a Pope. This hee deliuered without iust witnesse, and this I confuted from the direct and expresse doctrines of *Caluine* and *Beza*. And after a long iustification of them concerning their doctrine, at the length in the *chap. 7. pag.* 119. I concluded thus; *Wee haue heard of their opinions, haue you any thing to except against their practise?* Which question was not made in way of deniall, as though my Aduersary would not charge *Caluine* and *Beza* with any practise of rebellion; but after the maner of art and common speech, by way of *Transition*, to shew more orderly and emphatically what was by the *Moderate Answerer* obiected against their practise, which is set downe immediately after. And yet *P. R.* maketh this one of his instances, and proofes of my fraudulent dealings. Heere I would charge my Christian Reader in the obligation of truth it selfe to giue him audience, for his clamor is vehement, and his accusation may seeme to bee important. Thus then *P. R.*[1] *And hauing said thus, hee* (Tho. Morton) *passeth yet further, adding a second prouocation about practise, in these words:* We haue heard of their opinion (*to wit*, of Caluine and Beza) haue you any thing to except against their practise? *And this demand he made, when he knew and had seene his Aduersaries many and most grieuous accusations against them in that kind, not only for mouing that people of* Geneua *to open rebellion against their Lord and Prince the Bishop, but also the people of* France, *against their King and Soueraigne, citing good authorities for the same, saying:* Caluine and Beza armed the Subiects against their Prince *of Geneua*, and (as Caluine *himselfe, Doctor* Suttcliffe, *and the Bishop of* Canterbury be witnesses) deposed their Soueraigne from his Temporall right, and euer after continued in that state of rebellion. They celebrated also a Councell, wherein was concluded that K. Francis the Second, then king of France, his wife the Queene, his children, Queene mother, &c. should be destroied. *And his quotations for these things are:* Beza lib. de iure Migistrat. Suttcliff. answ. to Suppl. and Survey. Calvin in Epist. Pet. Far. orat. cont. Sect. defens. reg. &

[1] Treatis. *Mitig.* c. 4. num. 42. pag. 133.

" *Mod. Answ.* c. 9.

» & relig. &c. *All which being seene by our Minister, he demandeth notwithstanding, as you haue heard, with this hypocrisie,* » Haue you any thing to except against their practise? *as though* » *there were nothing at all not only not to be accused or reprehended* » *in them, but not so much as to be excepted against. And is not this* » *notable dissimulation in a matter so cleere and euident? Who can* » *beleeue this Minister heereafter?*

87 Nay is there any but will rather beleeue mee heereafter when he shall see me abused by so intolerable impudency as I am perswaded he neuer heard of heeretofore? For I am accused to haue vsed that interrogation [*Haue you any thing to say vnto their practise?*] in dissimulation, as though I would haue concealed my Aduersaries obiection against *Caluin* and *Beza*, in pretence that *nothing at all were not onely not to bee accused or reprehended, but not so much as to be excepted against.* Wherunto I haue only this to answer, that there is nothing in all this obiection which hath not beene both literally expressed by me, and also particularly confuted. Let vs compare the obiection as it is repeated by *P. R.* and see if there bee any thing which I haue pretermitted. First these words, *Caluin and Beza armed Subiects against their Prince of Geneua*: these [b] I haue *verbatim* expressed, except only that for *At Geneua*, I haue *Of Geneua*. Can there be any falshood in the particle *Of*? In the next words, *And as Caluin himselfe, Doctor Suttcliffe and the Bishop of Canterbury bee witnesses, deposed their Souer aigne from his temporall right, and euer after continued in that state of rebellion.* And this [f] hath beene by me repeated also *verbatim*, excepting that for *continued*, I said *continue*. And can *P. R.* suspect any hypocrisie in the letter *d*? The next, *They celebrated a Councell, wherein was concluded that K. Francis the Second, the king of France, his wife the Queene, his children, Queene-Mother should be destroied.* This obiection also hath beene set downe in these words: [e] *Caluin and Beza and the rest of the holy Synod say that the Kings and Queenes of France, their children, posterity and all Magistrates must be put to death, and so euery Protestant must be more than a Pope.* Heere is more propounded than this my rigid Aduersary hath noted, namely,

[b] The Full Satisfaction part. 2. cap. 7. pag. 119.

[f] Satisf. part. 2. cap. 7. pag. 119

[e] Satisf. part. 2. cap. 4. pag. 107

Euery

Euery Protestant shall so be a Pope. Shall hee feare any ambush in this clause? Lastly the testimonies which are heere repeated, [a] were by me particularly both noted, and answered: and most of these *P. R.* himselfe (that wee may know he was not ignorant heereof) hath particularly discussed. Vnder what visard then could he call a perfect manifestation of this obiection a *dissimulation?* or a full answer vnto euery obiected exception a concealement, as though *nothing had beene reprehended?* or a particular repetition and satisfaction to all, an *hypocriticall* dealing, *as though there had beene nothing obiected at all?* Sure I am, it had beene more for the credit of *P. R.* if hee had plaid the hypocrite in this taxation, to vse some colourable slander, and not to haue laid himselfe so nakedly shamefull in this kind, that very boyes, by comparing these places, may see his deformitie. But O the impotency of malice! it is not vnlike vnto the blindnesse of the *Sodomites*, who after that they had seen *Lots* house, yet groped for the doore. So *P. R.* a little after [x] discusseth some of my Answers, to this obiection of *Practise*, and yet now will not acknowledge the beginning.

[a] *Satisf.* pag. 119. *Beza de iure magist. Suttcliff. Arch. Can. Caluin*, And pag. 111. *P. Frarer.*

[x] Tract. *Mitigat.* c. 4. n. 42. pag. 138.

An eight falsitie of P. R.

88 To the [y] *Moderate Answerer* obiecting the Commotion of *Wiat* in *Norfolke*, in the dayes of *Q. Mary*, which my friend *P. R.* hath obserued, & therby (to make me one of his incorporation) would conclude me a double Liar. Let vs heare him. [z] *To that then of* Sir Thomas Wiat, *the Duke of* Suffolke, *and others, he answereth diuersly. First,* The History relateth (*saith he*) the pretence of Sir Thomas Wiat thus: A Proclamation against the Queenes mariage, desiring all English men to ioyn for defence of the Realme, &c. *Then that in* Queene Maries Oration against Wiat there is not to be found (*sayth he*) any scruple concerning the cause of Religion. *Thirdly*, that no Minister of the Gospell was brought in question as a Commotioner in that cause. *Lastly*, if intent might answer for Protestants accused in that name, then is it plaine, that it was not Religion; if for Wiat and his fellowes, it is plaine, that it was not against the Queene or State, but for both. *So he. In all which*

[y] *Satisfaction.* part. 2. cap. 3. pag. 102.

[z] Treatise. *Mitig.* cap. 4. num. 36. & 37. pag. 128.

» *which different clauses of Answer, consider if any one be in it selfe*
» *true: for as for the first and second, though* Wiat *pretendeth in*
» *his Proclamation the sayd mariage with* Spaine *to be the chiefe*
» *cause, yet not alone, but that the Queen and Counsell (saith Fox)*
» *would also by this mariage, as he affirmed, bring vpon the realme*
» *miserable seruitude, and establish Popish religion.* ¶ *And the*
Fox anno 1554. pag. 1289. » *same* Fox *relateth Queene* Maries *words in her Oration thus:*
» That the matter of the marriage is but a Spanish cloake *(saith*
» *she)* to couer their pretenced purpose against our religion. *So*
» *as in these two points the Minister lieth openly, but more in the*
» *last,* That Wiats attempt was not against Queene Mary or the
» State, but for both: *For that Q.* Marie *in the same Oration, as*
» *both* Fox *and* Hollinshed *doe ioyntly relate, affirmed* Wiats *an-*
» *swer to haue beene to* Sir Edward Hastings *and* Sir Tho. Corn-
» wallis, *sent from her vnto them, which he also at his arraignment*
confessed, That he and his would haue the gouernance of her person, the keeping of the Tower, and the placing of her Counsellers.

89 The first lie he noteth, is in relating of the *Oration of Q. Marie*, wherein I sayd there was *no scruple concerning Religion:* and I cited for witnesse *Hollinshed.* This Authour (as we may perceiue) *P. R.* hath examined, and could finde nothing in him against me for this first point touching *Q. Maries Oration:* therefore he seeketh other euidence, and bringeth against me the testimonie of *M. Fox*, wherein there is mention of *Religion.* What therefore? Therfore I am by him condemned for a liar. Nay, but rather by this opposing *M. Fox P. R.* hath wilily imitated the fraud of a fox, which creature, men say, doth vsually prey furthest from home. So likewise *P. R.* if he would haue proued me a liar, should haue done it out of *Hollinsheds* relation of *Q. Maries Oration*, which was the witnesse whom I produced: but he wanting cause of reproofe heerein, doth therefore range further to conuince me of lying by the testimony which I mentioned not. But whereas this *Mitigator* hath sayd, That * *Aduertisement was giuen him, that this Minister T. M. was Chaplaine vnto my L. of Canturbury* (and vpon this Aduertisement doth note me for his

* Treatise *Mitig.* pag. 92. P. R. confuted by himselfe.

Graces

Graces Chaplaine) when he ſhall be more certainly informed that *the Miniſter* was neuer *Chaplaine* to his Grace, I would but know whether he will giue his Reader leaue to call him a Liar, or no. For, if, becauſe he was deceiued in his *Aduertiſement*, he will be iudged a liar, then can not he (a liar) be a fit man to charge another of *vntruth*: if he will auouch his owne truth and ſinceritie, becauſe he reported nothing but whereof by his *Aduertiſer* he had been informed, then am I no liar, who haue ſayd no more than whereunto my Authour *Hollinſhed* did direct me. So that my Aduerſarie is now chargeable by an argument *à paribus*, either to acquit me, or els to condemne himſelfe. We may ſuffer profeſſors of the feats of *Leger demaine* to delude the beholders, to conuey one mans ring into another mans pocket, & then call him a coſener; but for vs Diuines to play ſuch tricks, as he hath done, changing *Hollinſhed* into *M. Fox*, and then to tax me for falſhood, is a deuice inexcuſable. His ſecond exception is of no better moment, becauſe euen that purpoſe of *Wiat*, To keepe the Tower, wanted not the ſuppoſed intention, which was, The preſeruation of the *Queene and State*: yet ſo farre was it from me to iuſtifie any ſuch rebellious action, that I (according to the maner of Schooles, vſing *argumento ad hominem*) obiected this to our Romiſh Aduerſaries, only, that they, by accuſing of *Wiat*, (who profeſſed a good intent) might learne to condemne themſelues, whoſe only ground of Rebellion is pretence of a Catholike intent; the rather, becauſe a good intent deſtitute of precept and commandement of God, is but (as the Apoſtle teacheth) [b] *a damnable* good. Wherefore the two lies which *P. R.* would haue beſtowed vpon me, he by vertue of his place and patent may keepe to himſelfe.

[b] Rom. 3. 8.

A ninth falſhood of P. R.

90 A ninth falſhood may be accounted, his peremptorie reprehenſion of our Engliſh Tranſlation vpon that of Eſa. 29. *They are blinde &c.* as diſſenting from the *Latine, Greeke, and Hebrew, both in words and ſenſe*. In which cenſure he [c] hath

[c] See aboue §. 5. num. 15. & 16.

beene conuinced of a grosse falshood in both, by the iudgement of his owne Doctors.

A tenth falsitie of P. R.

[a] See aboue §.6. num.17. & 18.

91 For a tenth take his wilfull [a] falshood in pressing *one* only Edition of *Carerius*, thereby accusing me of falshood in corrupting that Authour: whereas the *Collen* Edition hath iustified me, and discouered this disposition of *P. R.* to haue been willing that I should rather be condemned rashly than iustly acquitted.

An eleuenth and twelfth fraud of P. R.

[c] See aboue §.7. num.21.

92 For an eleuenth may be remembred his vniust [c] crimination, in noting me as a *notable liar* for affirming that, which his owne triple instance doth euidently euince. We may [f] adde for a twelfth his obiection of the Authour *Frisingensis*; wherein, that he might prooue me a *Falsificator*, he doth himselfe play foure excellent feats of falshood.

[f] See abone §.8. num.28.

A thirteenth new and noble falshood.

93 I may not deale niggardly with *P. R.* especially in recounting vnto him his owne, and therefore to his former dozzen adde one other for aduantage, yet such an one as whereat most of the former, although otherwise very impudent, may seeme to blush. *P. R.* pleadeth for their mentall Æquiuocation, (which I haue truly called the *Baud* or Broker of their Rebellon) after this maner: [g] *The Minister himselfe* (sayth he) *doth in effect confesse heere in his second Treatise, that for the space of the last 400 yeeres the doctrine of Equinocation hath beene receiued for true in our Schooles, and consequently practised thorowout all Christendome &c.* And againe: [h] *How can a doctrine so vgly and abominable* (as T. M. calleth it) *be receiued so generally thorowout the Christian world, that is to say, The doctrine of all Schooles, Chaires, Vniuersities, Casuists, Lawyers both Canon and Ciuill, Diuines both Scholasticall and Positiue approouing the same?* And a little after: *Was there none at the first admittance of it to stand for the truth, and reason to the contrary in any Prouince or State, in any place or time, within the compasse of 400 yeeres?* And yet againe: [i] *Seeing it hath beene admitted so long*

[g] Treatise *Mitig.* cap. 7. num. 8. pag. 279.

[h] Ib. num. 12. pag. 281.

[i] Ib. num. 15. pag. 284.

time

time in Christendome, as our Aduersaries doe confesse, and that it hath beene receiued so vniuersally and generally both by Prelates and people; and if it haue beene so publikely taught by all learned men, and contradicted by none, it ought to be a great argument to discreet men, that it hath some ground of truth.

It seemeth to me, that *P. R.* after that by custome of falsifying he had cast himselfe into such a slumber, that he had little sense of lying; now at length he may be thought to be fallen into a dead sleepe, and to haue cast away all conscience of truth: as may appeare by these so large and lauish assertions. The summary points are two:

94 The first is in peruerting my confession. *The Minister himselfe* (sayth P. R.) *doth in effect confesse heerein his second Treatise, That for the space of the last 400 yeeres the doctrine of Æquiuocation hath beene receiued for true in Schooles, and consequently practised thorowout all Christendome, and generally receiued of all Chaires, Vniuersities, Schooles, Diuines, Casuists, &c.* Is it euen so *P. R.*? Can you extract such a generall consequent out of the confession of the *Minister*? Did he euer acknowledge your mentall Æquiuocation so vniuersall, as you make it, of all *Vniuersities, Schooles, Diuines, Casuists*? Nay did not he [k] confute this your assertion of *generalitie* by the expresse sentence of your owne Doctour *Genesius Sepulueda*? His words are these: [l] *This maner of equiuocating is against the authoritie of most ancient and chiefe Theologers or Diuines* (meaning the Schoole-Diuines) *and none before Gabriel* (a Schooleman) *taught it.* Is this to confesse a generallitie? Or, could it be called then vniuersall, when but *one* man set it first abroch? Other testimonies of *Genesius* against Equiuocating *P. R.* did seriously examine, and nimbly ouerskip this.

[k] *Satisf.* Part. 3. cap. 12.

[l] *Genesius in Theoph. cap. 6.*

95 Againe, I neuer sayd that all Romish Priests were guiltie of this part of perfidious doctrine of *mentall Æquiuocation*: but proued, that not aboue 400 yeeres since *mentall Equiuocation* was heard of euen in Romish schooles, and that the first that is read of to haue defended it was *Gabriel Biel* a leud Sophister, after it was entertained by *Sylvester* and *Angelus*, and some other few such Glozers, but was not then general among them

them. We see therefore that *P. R.* his consequent is from a confession of a few particulars to inferre a generall conclusion, *All Diuines, All Casuists, &c.* The lamenesse of this consequent I shall make appeare by a like example, thus: Let me affirme with some Historians, that not aboue an hundred yeres agoe (or thereabout) the Neapolitane disease, commonly called the French pocks, tooke possession in Christendome, since which time some parties haue beene miserably afflicted therewith. Vpon this Assertion, by the consequent of our *Mitigator*, it must follow, That since these hundred yeeres haue all Cities, Townes, Villages, Schooles, People, Priests in Christendome, yea euen our *Mitigatour* himselfe, become such a kinde of *Neapolitanes*. And why may not this example fit? Sure I am, that *mentall* Equiuocating, whomsoeuer it infecteth, is nothing els than a pocke and pestilence in the soule. We leaue this falshood taken from consequent, and seeke out a more sensible proofe of his palpable falsitie than this.

P.R. confuted by a Simile.

P. R. *his Æquiuocation proued a lie, and himselfe a Falsifier, by the confessions of three Iesuits.*

96 The second falsitie is in his plaine asseueration, That *mentall* æquiuocation (for heereupon only we dispute) hath beene *vniuersally receiued of all Prelates and People in Christendome, and not contradicted by any.* Let vs first vnderstand what kinde of æquiuocation *P. R.* doth defend. " *Mentall aequiuocation is* " *when any speech hath or may haue a double sense, not by any double* " *signification or composition of words themselues, but only by some* " *reseruation in the speaker, whereby his meaning is made different* " *from that sense, which the words that are vttered do beare without* " *that reseruation.* This kinde of æquiuocation *P. R.* imbraceth, and therunto he saith, *There hath beene no one which hath made contradiction.*

" Treatise *Mitig.* cap. 12. num. 3. pag. 484.

The first witnesse conuincing this Mitigation *of falshood is* Azorius *a learned Iesuit.*

97 This *Azorius* a great Casuist, in his booke of *Morall Institution, printed at Rome Anno* 1600 *by licence of his Superiours*

(as the title signifieth) doth discusse this point of æquiuocation, and his resolution is, That [a] *there is nothing so false* (saith he) *which may not be freed from a lie if we may keepe something secret in our mindes, for by this meanes when any thing is asked of vs, we may deny that we haue it (although indeed we haue it,) vnderstanding in our minds* [*that we may giue it.*] *Whatsoeuer we haue done, seene, thought, or decreed, being demanded thereof, we may by this meanes answer without a lie that we haue not done, nor seene, nor thought, nor decreed, namely, in that sense* [*that we may tell it vnto you.*] *But I am of another opinion, which I will manifest by certeine rules.* His fift rule doth hit the naile on the head, which is this. * *The fift rule: If the words we vse are not according to their common signification among men, ambiguous or doubtfull, and haue only one sense, we ought to vse them in that sense which they haue in themselues: neither is it lawfull for vs, although we be examined against right and iustice, to detort or turne our speech by our inward conceit of minde, because it is not lawfull for vs to lie: but he doth lie who vnderstandeth his speeches otherwise than they do signifie in themselues.* The difference between our *Mitigator* and this *Iesuit* is no more than this: First, *P. R.* defendeth an æquiuocation which is when the speech hath *no double sense in the outward words themselues*, but *only* in some secret reseruation *in the minde of the speaker*. But *Azorius* saith, That we *ought not to vse* any sense of speech which is *not in the words themselues, but only in the inward thought of him that speaketh*. Secondly, *P. R.* mainteineth, That his mentall reseruation *is a truth*: but *Azorius* concludeth, That it *is a lie*. And can there be a greater contradiction than this? How then

[a] Meo tamen iudicio illi regulam ad plura extendunt, & trahunt, quàm par sit, & quàm Nauarrus, Syluester, & Angelus voluerint. Nihil n. tàm falsum esse potest, quod non queat ab omni mendacio liberari, si aliquid arbitratu nostro mente tacitũ retineamus. Possemus enim quicquid à nobis petitur, quamuis id apud nos habeamus, diffiteri nos habere, intelligentes, vt demus: quicquid fecerimus, quicquid viderimus, quicquid cogitauerimus, decreuerimus, de eo rogati, possemus absque mendacio dicere, Non fecimus, non vidimus, non cogitauimus, non decreuimus, eo nimirùm sensu, vt tibi dicamus, vel, quod tibi dicere debeamus. Quare mihi aliud videtur, quod quibusdam regulis subiectis breuiter perstringam. *Azor. Iesu. Instit. Moral. part. 1. lib. 11. cap. 4.* § Meo tamen. *pag. 1335.* Romæ cùm priuilegio. Anno 1600. Superiorum permissu. * Quinta regula: Si reuerà verba, quibus vtimur, significatione suâ & communi hominum vsu ambigua non sunt, nec habent nisi vnum tantummodò sensum, ea vsurpare debemus eo sensu, quem reddũt, nec licet nobis, etiam si contra ius fasq; omne interrogemur, aliquid mentis cogitatione concipiendo in aliud detorquere; nunquam enim fas est mentiri: at is mentitur, qui verba aliter accipit, atq; ipsa significant. *Azor. Iesu. quo supra, in fine cap.*

could our *Mitigator* affirme, That mentall æquiuocation *is defended of Caſuiſts and Doctors, and contradicted by none*? Hath he any ſhadow of excuſe by ignorance of the Authour and place? No, for he hath * alleged this Author, vpon this queſtion of æquiuocation, foure times; and the place was particularly obiected in my Confutation therof: or els be helped by difference of Tranſlation or Edition? He wil not pretend this; therefore can no euaſion ſerue him, except hee will anſwer, That he thought good in citing Authors for defenſe of æquiuocation to æquiuocate. Whence any may diſcerne what credit ſuch wretched Æquiuocators may deſerue.

* Treatiſe *Mitigat.* pag. 355. & 420. & 429. & 450.

A ſecond witneſſe conuincing P. R. *of falſhood.*

98 When I had [r] obiected againſt the Romaniſts that popiſh Prieſts (yet not ſaying that all of them held this opinion) are guilty of this perfidiouſneſſe of violating an oath by mentall equiuocation: my firſt Aduerſary, called the *Moderate Anſwerer*, that he might a little qualifie the hatefulneſſe of that equiuocating ſect: did tell vs that [q] *A Ieſuit famous amongſt the Caſuiſts, Emanuel Sà in his Aphoriſmes* writeth of this matter in theſe words: *Quidam dicunt, &c. Some there bee who ſay that he who is not bound to anſwer vnto the intention of the examiner, may anſwer by reſeruation of ſome thing in his owne minde, to wit,* [*that it is not ſo,* viz. *that I muſt tell it vnto you*] *although others do not admit this maner of anſwering, and peraduenture vpon better reaſon than the former. Whereby it is manifeſt* (ſaith that *Moderate Anſwerer*) *that all Catholikes do not allow of æquiuocation.* Thus farre hee: confeſſing heereby that diuers *Catholike Authours* haue contradicted this equiuocating forgerie, which *P. R.* hath auouched *no Catholike writer did euer contradict.* Is it poſſible that my Aduerſary can free himſelfe from a falſitie corroding the conſcience? The *Edition* is but one, the *tranſlation* is the ſame, the place was well knowen, being obiected by the *Moderate Anſwerer*, whom hee hath commended as a *learned performer* and is furthermore repeated in my booke of [r] *Satisfaction*, which hee hath laboured to confute. Say then Sir *Mitigatour*, will you thinke this *Moderate*

[r] *Satisf.* part. 2. ca. 26. in the beginning.

[q] *Mod. Anſw.* cap. 10.

[r] Part. 1. c. 27. pag. 89.

derate Answer to be true or no; take heed what you say, you haue a Woolfe by the eares (according to the prouerbe) if you hold him, hee will bite your hands, if you let him goe hee will flie in your face. Say therfore: was that answer of your fellow true, wherin it is said, that *diuers Catholikes do not allow of this doctrine of equiuocation?* Then are you a false Proctor, for this your wilfull assertion, to wit, *Not one Catholike Doctour doth contradict it.* Or will you say that Answer was vntrue? then must you be iudged a false sycophant, for approouing that for *A iust and Moderate Answer, wherein the Author hath acquitted himselfe learnedly*, and yet do thinke it to be *vntrue.* A dilemma.

The third witnesse conuincing P. R. *of falshood.*

99 *Maldonat* a principall Iesuit and Casuist resolueth thus; [f] *Whosoeuer doth endeuor by faining to deceiue another, although he intend to signifie something else, yet, doubtlesse, he lieth.* This testimony [t] I vsed for confutation of this vile art. Which *P. R.* could not be ignorant of, because [u] hee endeuoured to satisfie other testimonies, as of *Genesius* and *Sotus.* But this Authour *Maldonat* specified in the same place, *P. R.* (as a weaker Aduersary will doe his ouermatch) did willingly pretermit. But what now will follow of all this? what will *P. R.* obiect? Let vs but heare what hath been said, and then he shall know what may be said. He claimed *an vniuersall approbation of mentall Equiuocation from the consent of all Vniuersities, Diuines and Casuists, &c. no one contradicting that doctrine.* He hath also said, that [x] *A generall Proposition is such, that if any one instance may be giuen to the contrary, the whole is ouerthrowen.* Now haue I instanced vnto his generall of *All Vniuersities, all Prelates, all Casuists, all people*, in three famous Iesuists and Casuists, *Azorius, Sà., Maldonate*, and in the confession of his fellow the *Moderate Answerer*, acknowledging that *diuers Catholikes do not approoue their mentall reseruation*: all from direct testimonies of these Authors certainely knowen vnto this *Mitigator.* And therefore must conclude, that seeing any one knowen instance may *ouerthrow a whole generall*, our *Mitigator* by these foure seuerall knowen instances is to be accounted a *foure-fold* falsificator.

[f] Maldonat. cō. in Luc. vlt. vers. 28.
[t] *Satisf.* part. 3 cap. 4. pa. 59.
[u] Treat. *Mitig.* ca. 14. nū. 4. pa. 409. 510.
[x] Treat. *Mitig.* ca. 1. num. 38. pag. 74.

falsificator. I haue exceeded the proportion of our *Mitigators* demand, who hath required but two or three instances in any, though in himself, of vnsatisfiable falshoods, I haue offerd him thirteene, as many as I could well bundle vp in this briefe *Preamble*, reseruing the rest for the exact *Incounter*, when I doubt not, but vpon the discouery of his vnconscionable deprauations he will wish that his braines had beene a-sleepe, when hee framed this *Mitigation*, rather than his fraudulent and malicious disposition should be discouered. Wherof there will be yet more proofe in his calumniations following: wherunto I now addresse my *Satisfaction* in

---

An Answer to the Accusations of falshood, which the Mitigator hath obiected to his Aduersary *Th. Morton, singling out of many, not such which might seeme vnto me most easilie answered: but those which P. R, hath most vehemently pressed and vrged, as by his insolent insultations will appeare.*

---

§. 18.

100. ALthough the discouered calumnious spirit of *P. R.* might so preiudice the credit of his other taxations, that, in the opinion of any religious Reader, I might seeme to be absolued euen before I be accused; yet considering that in slander, as in a bodily hurt *Etsi vulnus sanetur, cicatrix manet tamen Though the wound be cured, yet the scarre doth remaine*; and that it was no sufficient iustification for the one thiefe vpon the Crosse to tell his fellow, saying: * *Thou also art in the same condemnation:* Therefore doe I willingly addresse my Apologie and defence against his calumniations, especially such wherein he insisteth and insulteth most; wherunto I shall giue (I hope) such satisfaction, as that not only the *wound* of slander may be cured, but euen also the suspicious *scarre* of imputation may be wiped away.

* Luc. 23.

The

The first obiected falsification, whereupon he maketh this insultation: *It is a malicious lie of the Minister, having neither simplicitie nor truth, but of a lost conscience by manifest and malicious calumniations.*

101 *P. R.* beginneth thus: "*He* (Tho. Morton) *laieth before his Maiesty a certaine obseruation about Popes names, as full fraught with malice and deceitfulnesse, as the former with vanity: and he layeth the obseruation vpon* Polydore Virgil, *though citing no place for it.* Polydore obserueth (*saith hee*) that the Popes a long time in their election had their names changed by Antiphrasis, viz. the elected if he were by naturall disposition fearefull, was named *Leo*, if cruell, *Clement*, if vnciuill *Vrbanus*, if wicked *Pius*, if couetous *Bonifacius*, if in all behauior intolerable, *Innocentius*. *And with this hee thinketh to haue laid downe an obseruation of importance. But why had he not adioined also, that if he were carelesse of his flocke, then* Gregory *must bee his name, which importeth a vigilant Pastor? But now let the iudicious Reader obserue the malice and falshood of this obseruation, and thereby iudge whether the Authour thereof bee* a Minister of simple truth, *or no.* Polydore *saith onely that sometimes Popes as other Princes in like maner haue had names that haue beene different, or rather contrary to their nature and maners, which is an ordinary case, if we examine the signification of men and womens names; but that Popes names were changed of purpose by Antiphrasis, or contrary speech to couer their defects, as heere is set downe, this is a malicious lie of the Minister, and hath neither simplicity nor truth in it: for that all those names heere mentioned of* Leo, Clemens, Vrbanus, Pius, Bonifacius, Innocentius *and* Gregory *were chosen by the Popes that tooke them for the great reuerence and estimation they had of certaine excellent men of that name, that went before them, as also for the good abodement of their future gouernment, and to be stirred vp the more by the memory of those names to the vertues signified by them: but especially for the honour and imitation of the first Popes that bare those names.*

" a Treatise *Mitig. epist. dedic. num.* 18. & 19.

The Answer.

[b] Ind. Expurg. Belg. pag. 195. [a] Primus honos Romano Pontifici habetur, vt si minùs pulchro honestetur nomine, ei statim creato liceat illud mutare. Verbi gratia, non extra iocum dictũ sit, Si homo maleficus anteà fortè fuerit, vt Bonifacius appelletur: si timidus, Leo: si rusticus, Vrbanus: si improbus, Innocentius: si ferox, Clemens: si malè audiuerit, Benedictus: vt saltem nomine Pontifex ornamẽto sit dignitati. Eius autem rei auctor fuisse dicitur Sergius secundus, cui cum *Os porci* diceretur, ad obscœnã nominis vocem tollendã, datum est, vt aliud sibi nomẽ aptaret. *Polyd.* lib. 4. de Inu. rerũ, c. 10.

102 The first note of falshood he intimateth to be, becaufe *I laid my obſeruation vpon Polydore, citing no place for it.* Would not his preiudicate Reader now thinke that I had fraudulently ſuggeſted a teſtimonie in the name of *Polydore*, which cannot be found; and in the guiltineſſe heereof *to haue cited no place?* But heere I make a *Nouerint vniuerſi*, to giue euery Reader to vnderſtand, that the ſentence which I reported vpon my memory is certainly extant in the ancient Editions of *Polydore*, *lib. 4. Inuent. ca.* 10. in theſe words, *Primus honos, &c.* which ſentence becauſe it doth not a little offend the ſuperſtitious Romaniſts, therfore *An. Dom.* 1572. by the authority of Pope *Pius Quin.* it is commanded in theſe words [[b] *Vſque ad, aliud ſibi nomen aptaret, Deleatur*] that is, faire and cleane *to bee blotted out.* Can then this be ought but a tranſcendent impudency to blame me for not citing that teſtimony, which his Pope, leſt it ſhould be cited hath vtterly razed out? Hee ſeeth his Pope pulling out a mans tongue, and then would compell mee to looke whether I can find it in his mouth: but although they haue made *Polydore* by their *Index expurgatorius*, almoſt in euery page dumbe, not ſuffering him to beare witneſſe againſt the pride of Popes, the licentiouſneſſe of Monkes, the ſuperſtitions of their Church, the nouelties of their manifold traditions and inuentions; yet our ancient *Polydore* now dwelling amongſt Proteſtants (Printed *An.* 1570. *Baſileæ*) hath a tongue which will tell tales, ſaying plainely that, [a] *This is the firſt honour which is giuen vnto the Pope of Rome, that if peraduenture his name* (before election) *be ſomewhat vnſeemely, he may change it as ſoone as he is created. As for example, (which may not bee ſpoken without a ieſt) if peraduenture hee had beene before* (his creation) *a wicked man, that then he ſhould be called* Bonifacius, *that is, a good doer: if fearefull, then* Leo, *that is, a Lion: if ruſticall, then* Vrbanus, *that is, ciuill: if vngodly, then* Innocentius, *that is, innocent: if furious, then* Clemens, *that is, gentle: if infamous, then* Benedictus, *that is, a man of a good report, ſhould be his name. The firſt Author of this change of names* (which was

Anno

Anno 1052.) *was Pope Sergius Secundus, whose proper name was Hogs-face: who, that he might auoid the ignominy of his own name, was permitted to chuse another.*

103 Obserue now what I haue reported from *Polydore*, viz. *that Popes names were changed by antiphrase, or contrary speech, to couer their defects.* And this is no whit different from the testimony of *Polydore*, who saith, that *If the Pope were* before his creation *wicked, he did take the name of godly vpon him: if rigorous, then gentle, &c.* Which kind of alteration of names is not vnlike a Gregorian, (as some call it) or artificiall couer for a baldhead. Let therefore the iudicious Reader iudge from what spirit, whether of ignorance or malice, haue proceeded these slanderous inuectiues, calling my true relation *malice and falshood*: and againe, *a malicious lie of the Minister, which hath neither simplicity nor truth in it.* It is no rare thing for women of suspected conuersation, lest they should bee called by their proper names, to miscall honest Matrons first. Peraduenture *P. R.* vseth the same art in naming me a Liar. But I had rather interpret his meaning in the best part, to imagine that hee might meane by his owne open and false detraction to proue me his Aduersary, to be *A Minister of simple truth.*

A second obiection of falshood, whereupon hee insulteth thus: *This false Lad setteth downe his owne fiction: and is not this perfidious dealing? can any excuse him from falshood and malice in so open treachery?*

104 *P. R.* groweth yet hotter, and casteth coales about him, thus; [4] *He* (viz. *Tho. Morton*) *hath these words*: Pope Adrian being guiltie of like seditious practise against the Emperour Henry the Second, was choaked with a flie. *And in his quotation citeth* Nauclerus *for it*, Generatione 139. *which should bee* 39. *for that* Nauclerus *hath nothing neere so many generations in that part; and in stead of* Henry *the Second, hee should haue said* Fredericke *the First of that name, for that* Henry *the Second was before the time of our conquest, and almost two hundred yeers before* Adrian *the fourth our English Pope, of whom we now speak;*

[4] Treatise *Mitig.* ca. 2. n. 46. pa. 79.

» *who liued in the time of* King Stephen *and* King Henry *the Se-*
» *cond of* England, *and was an holy man, and accounted the Apostle*
» *of* Noruegia *for conuerting the same vnto our Christian faith, be-*
» *fore he was Pope, and all Authours do write honourably of him,*
» *and so doth* Nauclerus *affirme: and therefore though hee make*
» *mention of such a fable related by* Vrspergensis *that was a schis-*
» *maticall writer in those daies (who also doth not absolutely auouch*
» *it, but with this temperament,* vt fertur, *as the report goeth) yet*
» *doth the same* Nauclerus *reiect the same as false, and confuteth it*
» *by the testimonies of all other writers, especially of Italy that liued*
» *with him, and thereby knew best both his life and death. And yet*
» *all this notwithstanding will this false Lad* T. M. *needs set downe*
» *this history as true, affirming it for such, and neuer so much as gi-*
» *uing his Reader to vnderstand, that any other denied the same, or*
» *that the only Authour himselfe of this fiction doubted thereof. And*
» *is not this perfidious dealing? or can any man excuse him from false-*
» *hood and malice in this open treatherie?*

The Answer.

105 Not so Sir, both because (as I truly protest) I did not write this out of the Author himselfe, which I had neuer seene, but from collection out of some other booke: yet in the relation it selfe there appeareth no shadow of *malicious falshood*. First, there could not be *malice* in misquotation of the *Generation*, as an 139. for 39. which neither added nor detracted any thing from the matter it selfe, no more than to say *Peter* is 10. or an 100. yeeres of age doth conuince a man of fraud who intendeth only to proouе that *Peter* is a man. And whosoeuer shall obiect error of quotation, he may be quoted for one that is ignorant either what it is to write, or transcribe, or to print; for all these are subiect vnto misquotations. Now if there bee a fault in a peece of cloth, must we necessarily iudge that the spinner was to blame?

His cauill compared.

Secondly, what skilleth it whether it was *Henry* an Emperour, or *Fredericke* an Emperour, that was excommunicated by the Pope, when as the intended conclusion was onely this, that *Adrian* the Pope did excommunicate an *Emperour*, and

conspired

conspired against him? no more than if, when one should bee examined of murder, the accuser should say that the mortall wound was giuen with the right hand; and the party accused should gainesay it, prooving it was done with the left hand; could this difference be of any moment, when the maine question is, whether this man committed the murder, or no? in all this there is error (I confesse) but yet no falshood.

Thirdly, if where one only witnesse is required, I should say vnto *N.* you told me (I think) that *A.* did conspire against *F.* and died miserably. No (quoth *N.*) I did not: but heere is my brother *V.* that said something to this purpose. In all this we discerne only an errour in misciting the Authour (*N.*) but no falshood for want of a witnesse. So heere, where *V.* that is, the Abbat of *Vrspurg* was ready to say that which *N.* that is, *Nauclerus* was vnwilling to affirme, concerning the conspiracie of *A.* that is, the Pope *Adrian* against *F.* that is *Fredericke* the Emperour. O but *Abbas Vrspurgensis* did say onely, *fertur*, that is, *It is so reported*: and this a man may say of a fable. But I pray you Sir, what is there in Historiographers of after times but only case of *report*? So that whosoeuer shall cite any Historian who was not *αὐτόπτης*, that is, an eie-witnesse himselfe of that which he writeth; doth in citing him confesse that he speaketh but vpon *report*: yet euen this word [*fertur*] that is, [*It is so said*, or, *It is reported*, or, *The same is, &c.*] doth not necessarily betoken doubtfulnesse in him that vttereth it: which your owne Iesuit *Del Rio* would haue his Reader to obserue in a certaine sentence of S. *Gregory*.

106 The only colour of iust exception hee can bring, is this: *Because* (saith he) *Nauclerus reiecteth it to be false, and confuteth it by all writers, especially of Italy*. And what then? *Notwithstanding will this false Lad T. M. needs set it downe as true.* If age make diseases desperate, it is better be a lad then (that I may so say) a dad in falshood; for by how much more any is a father in lying, the more neere hee is in degree of kindred vnto the *father of lies*, in which line of descent I feare *P. R.* will appeare to be. For *Nauclerus* endeth his censure thus: *Verum enim vnus Itali nullam de hoc mentionem faciunt, &c. hæc & alia*

e Posterior Caietani coniectura, quia Gregor. magnus in homilia de amissa drachma non fuit ausus hos libros B. Dionysij asserere, & tantum ambigue loquitur vtes voce [fertur:] respõdeo sic loqui non quia ipse dubitauerat qui in Græcia eius libros legerat, &c. *Del Rio vind. Areopa. cap. 6. §. Posterior.* pag. 29.

ambiguum me reddunt quid potiùs eligendum quidq; credendũ sit. Scribimus enim res gestas affectu nonnunquam plus quàm veritatis amore ducti. He saith not that Italians denied this maner of death, but that they make no mention of it: neither can *Nauclerus* be said to haue confuted that which he left as doubtfull, saying, *I know not whether part to beleeue.* As for the truth of the story (for this is it which we should contend for) wee oppose the *Abbat Vrspergensis* vnto *Nauclerus*. But it is obiected, *Vrspergensis* was an enemie to the Pope. Well; and it may be answered, that the Monke *Nauclerus* was a friend to the Pope. And therefore we may know that as the bodily sight may bee hindered aswell by hot rheume as by colde, so falleth it out in passions of the mind, that loue may beget as blind commendation as hatred may a blind detraction.

107 But why should it be thought a matter incredible that such a dismall, and as it were disastrous end should befall a Pope? For, I feare, this is the only thing which so greatly offendeth the cholericke old man. Wherfore I entreat his patience (if yet there can be patience in so extreame malignity) to vnderstand what his owne Doctours haue written concerning the death of diuers Popes. [f] *Benè legitur Anastasium diuino nutu percussum interijsse*: that *Anastasius* was strooke with the hand of God and perished. Their last Chronologer *Binius*, highly priuiledged, telleth vs, that [g] *Ioannes decimus, quem infamis fœmina infami opere in solium Petri intrusit, per impudicam Theodoræ filiam cerniciali suffocatus obijt*: that is, Pope Iohn the tenth, whom an infamous woman by a lewd practise, did thrust into Peters chaire, afterward by the vnchaste daughter of Theodora hee was choaked or strangled with a pillow. Again, of Iohn the twelfth, he citeth one whom he calleth an Aduersary to this Pope, reporting [h] *Ioannem duodecimum quadam nocte, dum se cum alterius vxore oblectaret, intemporibus à diabolo percussum & inter paucos dies mortuum esse: huius historiæ veritatem non controuerto*: How this Pope one night in the midst of his dalliance with another mans wife was stroke in the head by the Diuell and shortly after died. A little after; *I doe not contend about the truth of this question.* What is now awanting but that an example of one Pope be

[f] *Ioan. de turre cremat. lib. de sum. Eccles. de Anastatio. Idẽ habet Platina: Supplementum Cronicbo. & liber Pontificalis in decret. Anastasi secundi.*

[g] *Binius in tom. 3. conc. pag. 1054. anno Dom. 912.*

[h] *Binius quo supra pag. 160.*

The dismall ends of diuers Popes.

be produced, vpon whom the vengeance of God seazed because of his rebellious opposition against temporall Lords? This [i] *Vrbanus Tertius (inquit Abbas Vrspergensis) quem multi Turbanum appellabant, eò quòd in odium Imperatoris turbaret Ecclesiam, nutu Dei percussus interijt* : Pope Vrbane the third, (saith Abbas Vrspergensis) *commonly called Turbane, because in hatred of the Emperour he troubled the Church, was strooke by God and perished.* So little cause could I haue to wound my Aduersaries with forged inuentions, being thus sufficiently furnished and prepared to confound them with true and plain confessed testimonies.

[i] Binius circ. Ann. Domin. 1198. pa. 1441.

A third obiection of falshood, whereupon he thus insulteth: *With such wee are forced to deale, that haue no conscience at all in cosenage.*

108 *P. R.* doth further charge me thus; [k] *And another like tricke he plaieth some few pages before this, again citing out of Doctour* Bouchiers *booke* De iusta abdicatione, *these words*: Tyrannum occidere honestum est, quod cuiuis impunè facere permittitur; quod ex communi consensu dico: *and then he Englisheth the same thus: Any man may lawfully murder a tyrant, which I defend, saith he, by common consent. But hee that shall read the place in the Authour himselfe shall find that hee holdeth the very contrary, to wit, that a priuate man may not kill a tyrant that is not first iudged and declared to bee a publike enemy by the Commonwealth: and he prooueth the same at large: first out of Scriptures, and by the decree of the generall Councel of Constance: his words be these:* Neque verò eo iure quod ad regnum habet nisi per publicum iudicium spoliari potest, &c. *Neither can a tyrant be deprined of that right which he hath to a kingdome but onely by publike iudgement: yea further also, so long as that right of kingdome remaineth, his person must be held for sacred; wherof ensueth, that no right remaineth to any priuate man against his life: and albeit any priuate man should bring foorth neuer so many priuate iniuries done by the said tyrant against him; as that hee had whipped him with iron rods, oppressed him, afflicted him, yet in this case must hee haue patience, according to the admonition of S. Peter* 1. 2. *That*

[k] Treatise *Mitig.* ca. 2. n. 47. p. 80.

we

» we muſt be obedient not only vnto good & modeſt lords, but alſo vn-
» to thoſe that be diſorderly, & that this is grace when a man for Gods
» cauſe doth ſuſtain & beare with patience iniuries vniuſtly done vn-
» to him, &c. And a little after P.R. thus [1] Let the Reader conſider
» the malicious falſhood of this Miniſter T.M. who in alleging
» that little ſentence before mentioned, about killing of a tyrant, ſtroke
» out the words of moſt importance: quem hoſtem Reſpub. iudi-
» cauerit; whom the common-wealth ſhall iudge for a publike ene-
» mie: and adding that other clauſe, which I ſay by common con-
» ſent, which is not there to be found. And with ſuch people we are
» forced to deale, that haue no conſcience at all in coſenage, &c.
So P.R.

[1] Mirr. ib. n.48. pa.81.

The Anſwer.

110 The Accuſation is grieuous, viz. *Malicious coſenage*; the Matter is hainous, viz. *Killing of Kings*; my Aduerſarie is ſe-
» rious and vrgent, ſaying, *Conſider &c.* and the iſſue impor-
» tant; which will be either a branding me for a notorious Slan-
» derer, or elſe my Aduerſarie for a toxicall and peſtilent *Miti-*
» *gator*. In thy examination and cenſure hereof (Chriſtian Rea-
» der) I require only iuſtice. [m] *Bouchier* in the place controuer-
» ted, doth make a double conſideration of a Tyrant; one is, as
» he doth iniurie vnto any priuate man [*Qui iuſta poteſtate ad*
» *priuatorum iniurias abutitur.*] In this caſe he reſolueth, That
» *à priuato occidi propterea non licet*: That is, *It is not lawfull for*
» *any priuate man to kill him.* The ſecond conſideration of a Ty-
» rant is, as he doth commit any publike iniurie, whether the
» caſe concerne Religion or the ciuill State, whereof he doth
» determine thus: *Qui in religionem ac patriam tyrannidem exer-*
» *ceat, hunc occidere reſpub. poſſit &c.* That is, *The Common-*
» *wealth may kill him, who ſhall tyrannize and iniurie the religion,*
» *and the countrey: it is ſo manifeſt that none can doubt of it, but*
» *ſuch as are deſtitute of common ſenſe: for if the people may arme*
» *themſelues againſt any noiſome beaſt, which may indanger the*
» *common ſafetie; then much more againſt ſuch a Tyrant, who is*
» *worſe than any beaſt.* But who may attempt the execution
» hereof? It followeth in the place by me formerly alleged:

[m] *Bouchier lib. 3. de Abdicat. Hen. 3. cap. 16. pag. 267.*

Priuato

Priuato cuiuis Tyrannum, quem hostem Resp. iudicauerit, occidere licitum est. That is, *It is lawfull for euery priuate man to kill him, whom the Common-wealth shall iudge to be a Tyrant.* We see now that *Bouchier* hath defended, both that *No priuate man may kill a Tyrant for iniurie against priuate men*, and also, that *Any priuate man may kill a Tyrant for common iniuries.*

111 I haue alleged the latter, *P. R.* hath opposed the former; both of vs haue affirmed a truth: where then is the falshood? This must be imputed to him who reporteth a truth, but not truly, that is, to a false purpose: wherof our Reader may easily iudge: for I haue obiected the testimonie of *Bouchier*, affirming, that in the case of common iniuries, whether in matter of Religion or State, *euery priuate man* is licensed to kill a Tyrant: and *Bouchiers* words auouch no lesse. *P. R.* opposeth the other negatiue testimonie of *Bouchier*, denying, that in *priuate iniuries* any *priuate* man may murder a Tyrant: and doth he therby conuince me of falshood? Nay rather doth he not seeke to iniurie me with falshood? For my whole Treatise of *Disconerie* intendeth only the publike, and neuer medleth with priuate occasions.

112 This will be plaine by example. The common rule of humanitie teacheth, that the Father, being but an Esquire, may in priuate conuents and meetings haue place aboue his sonne, though a Knight; but in places of publike resort, the Knight, though a sonne, is preferred before his Father. Heere be two considerations of the sonne and the father; the one is in respect of priuate, the other in regard of publike occasions. This Assertion of ciuility standing thus: Suppose my first Aduersarie the *Moderate Answerer* should auerre that *T. M.* saith that any sonne, being a Knight, may take place of his father, being but an Esquire: then my second Aduersarie *P. R.* hearing this, should oppose and say, It is false which thou allegest, for *T. M.* sayth the contrary, viz. That any Father, being an Esquire, may priuately take place of his sonne, though he be a Knight. Can this his taxation of falshood be thought true? Is it not altogether impertinent? For the assertions of *T. M.* were two: the first, That any such sonne must be pre-

P. R. confuted by a Simile.

ferred in publike: the second, That any such father must be preferred in priuate. And are these contrary? Are they not both true? And can one truth shoulder out another? The falshood therefore resteth in the Pleader, who sayd, That the allegation was false.

Wee reade in the Gospell this command of our Sauiour: [a] *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses chaire: whatsoeuer they bid you obserue, that obserue and doe: but after their works doe not, &c.* Here we heare vs charged *To do*, and *Not to do* as the *Pharisees*. And are these contrary? No: for the [*Doe*] is a commanding to follow their godly doctrine; the [*Doe not*] is a forbidding to imitate their vngodly life.

113 A second crime is in adding (as he sayth) of this clause [*Which I say by common consent.*] Looke in the Cha. 15. where the ground of this Position is layed, *That it is lawfull to kill a Tyrant*, he affirmeth it, saying, *Mirum est quàm magnum assirmando consensum habeat.* That is, *It is maruellous what a great consent this hath.* Then come to the 16. Chap. vpon the point now in question, he hath sayd, *He that denieth this, is distitute of common sense.* If therefore *maruellous consent* according to *common sense* may be thought more than equiualent vnto a *common consent*, then is my Aduersarie vnconscionably contentious to accuse me, as saying too much, where I had warrant to haue sayd more.

114 It may be, that the striking out of the *words of importance* [*Whom the Common-wealth shall iudge to be a publike enemie*] may somewhat preiudice my conscience. None can imagine this, but he that is not acquainted with the Authour, [*] who

[a] Matth 23 2.

[*] In publicis notorijsq; criminibus tanto aliter id fieri debet, quãto damnata ea per se publico præconio, ac naturæ sensu esse solent, vt August. de Cain & Abel, Euidentia crimis non eget clamore accusationis. Si latrones, si bestiæ, cùm irruunt, omni iure expugnantur, cur non tyrãnus quouis latrone & bestiâ deterior? - Duplex pœnæ genus, positiuæ vnũ, priuatiuæ alterum: quæ positiua est, formulam expectare debet; in priuatiua certè aliter se res habet, quod perfecto scelere, vel extra nouum iudicium vim habere inter Theologos confessum sit. *Then cap.* 3. Præueniri iudicium Ecclesiæ posse specialis probatio, vt Deut. 13. Statim interficies, ac sit primùm manus tua supra eum, vt Phinees scortum, Num. 25. arrepto pugione confodit. Sic Mattathias se gessit aduersus Israëlitam idololatram, 1. Machab. 2. Tales alij Israëlitis liberatores Othoniel, Aiod, Barach. *And a little after would proone this out of the Councell of* Lateran, *out of the Decree of Pope* Gelasius. *And in the former Chap.* Ecclesiæ iudicium non est, nisi celebri illo Apostolicę sedis theatro, nec reip. nisi in plenis & liberis comitijs esse potest. *In the end of the Chapter after Chap.* 5. Expectandi iudicij causas omnes in Henrico præclusas esse. *After in Chap.* 23. Frater Iacobus

spendeth

spendeth a whole Chapter in prouing this Position; *Preuenire iudicium vrgente negotio posse.* That is, *That the case may be so vrgent, that the publike iudgement* (against such a publike tyrant) *need not be expected, because where the crime is notorious, it is sufficiently condemned without further iudgement: for if theeues and beasts* (sayth he) *when they suddenly assault vs, may be resisted without iudiciall proceeding; then much more a tyrant, who is woorse than any beast.* And this doctrine he assumeth to proue necessarie both in case Temporall, when the King doth iniurie the Countrey, and in Ecclesiasticall transgression, when he offendeth publikely against Religion: particularly instancing in *Henry* 3. King of France, who was murdered by *Iacob Clemens* a Frier, before any publike iudgement of the Kingdome, which hee ascribeth to a Parliament, or els of the Church, which he attributeth to the Popes Consistorie. And yet he magnifieth the murderer (a priuate man) and extolleth him aboue those who are recorded in holy Writ, not vpon their priuate spirit, but by diuine inspiration to haue accomplished noble attempts. Heere, heere is matter indeed, whereby to decypher my Aduersaric to be no better than a painted Sepulcher, who is outwardly gaily adorned with the titles of *Moderation* and *Mitigation*: but inwardly (by holding *Boucheirs* doctrine) full of dead mens bones, I meane the dead bodies of Protestants: But how dead? Euen (as *S. Hierome* speaketh in the like case) *Voto occidunt, cùm gladio nequeant.* That is, *They wish them to be killed, whom they can not kill as they wish.* But this I reserue vnto my *Incounter*. I proceed to the next.

Clemens, non ita pridem Sacerdos factus — post celebratũ Missę sacrificium Henricum cultello, vt Æglonem Moabitem alter Aiod imò etiam fortiter in abdomine traiecit. Nihil iam vt fit quod Iudithæ Holopherné, aut Dauidis Goliathum obtruncantis, aut Samsonis maxillâ Asini mille viros interficientis historias admiremur, quia maiora his vidimus, & clamore meritò debeamus, Dextra Domini fecit virtutem, &c. *Thus much Bouchier.*

A fourth Obiection of falshood, wherin hee insulteth thus: *This testimonie is egregiously abused, &c.*

H 5 P *His fourth and last place is out of* M. William Reinolds *in his booke* De iusta Reip. auctoritate, &c. *whom he abuseth egregiously, both in ascribing to him that which is not his, and in deliuering the same corruptedly: and by a little you may learn much,* Ex vngue leonem *His words he citeth thus:* Rex humana creatura est, quia ab hominibus constituta: *and Englisheth in this maner*

P Treatise *Mitig.* cap. 2. num. 26. pag. 68.

» *maner* : A King is but a creature of mans creation. *Where you*
» *see first, that in the translation hee addeth* [but] *and* [mans
» creation] *of himselfe : for that the Latine hath no such* but, *nor*
» creation, *but* constitution. *Secondly, these words are not the*
» *words of* M. Reinolds, *but only cited by him out of* S. Peter. *And*
» *thirdly, they are alleged heere by* T. M. *to a quite contrary sense*
» *from the whole discourse and meaning of the Author, which was to*
» *exalt and magnifie the authoritie of Princes, as descending from*
» *God; and not to debase the same, as he is calumniated. For proofe*
» *heereof whosoeuer will looke vpon the booke and place it selfe, be-*
» *fore mentioned, shall finde that* M. Reinolds *purpose therein is to*
» *proone, That albeit earthly principalitie, power and authoritie, be*
» *called by the Apostle,* humana creatura : *yet that it is originally*
» *from God, and by his commandement to be obeyed. His words are*
» *these :* Hinc enim est, &c. *Hence it is, that albeit the Apostle doe*
» *call all earthly principalitie* a humane creature, *for that it is pla-*
» *ced in certaine men (from the beginning) by suffrages of the peo-*
» *ple, yet election of Princes doth flow from the law of nature, which*
» *God created ; and from the vse of reason, which God powred into*
» *man, and which is a little beame of diuine light drawen from that*
» *infinite brightnesse of Almighty God : therefore doth the Apostle*
» S. Paul *pronounce, That* there is no power but from God, and
» that he which resisteth this power, resisteth God himselfe.
So M. Reinolds.

The Answer.

116 This Allegation is, of all which yet I haue found, most obnoxious and alliable vnto taxation; which (God knoweth that I lie not) I receiued from suggestion, as the Author thereof *R. C.* can witnesse. For at that time I had not that *Rosæus, aliàs Reinolds*, neither by that present importunitie of occasions could seeke after him : which, I confesse, is greatly exorbitant : for I receiued it as a testimony debasing the authoritie of Kings : Vpon which presumption (if true) it could be no falshood in me to insert the particle *But*, especially being acquainted with the doctrine of *Card. Bellarmine*, who, that he may disable the authoritie of a King in comparison of the dignitie of a Pope, doth defend, That *Kings, being chosen by men,*

are

are not immediatly created by God: and yet, *The Pope, elected by Cardinals, hath his authoritie immediatly from God.* What is this els, but in a certeine degree to distinguish the creation of a King and creation of a Pope, the one as mans immediate creature, the other as Gods? And may it not be lawfull for any thus to repeate this comparison of *Bellarmine*, saying thus: Kings (after the doctrine of *Bellarmine*) haue their authoritie immediatly *But* from man, and that the *Pope hath his immediatly from God*? Is the Interiection *But* in this repetition like a theefe by the way to seduce and robbe, and is not rather as a true man to direct thee?

P. R. reprooued by a Simile.

117 Let *P. R.* imagine, that a boy in any of their Colleges should be so refractary, as knowing himselfe to descend from gentry, he should denie obedience to his Superior, because he thinketh him but of base parentage: the boy is brought before *P. R.* his Accuser allegeth, That hee had gloried in his owne gentilitie, and sayd that his Superiour was *But* basely borne. Will he thinke the accusation is false, because of the addition of *But*? No verily, but is by it made more plain & true, which is generall in all speeches of abasement: the *But* is (as I may so say) a Butte which hath infixed in it the marke and scope of the whole speech. Thus much for my addition *But*.

118 Furthermore, this I dare aduenture to say in behalfe of my Suggestor, That though that place alleged doe not agree vnto the collection, yet the scope of that Chapter and the next following doth imply as much, prooving that a King may be deposed by the people. Which doctrine hee there applieth vnto our English State, and by name to our late Soueraigne *Q. Elizabeth*: which indeed is to account a King nought els but an humane creature.

119 I know that *P. R.* may possibly insist, That he cited the text of *S. Peter*, 1. *Pet.* 2. who calleth a King or Gouernour constituted by man, *Humanam creaturam*, *An humane creature*. And then how could these words be reprehensible in *M. R.* which are warrantable by *S. Peter*? Wee must vnderstand, That the same speech may differ from it selfe by the diuers intention of the speakers. The faithfull Disciples of our

Sauiour did often salute Christ with *Haile Master*: we reade also of the malicious Iewes saying likewise *Haile Master*: but the Disciples in reuerence, the Iewes to scorne him. Looke to the words, heere is not ἀλλο, nothing can be more the same; looke to the sense and intention it is ἀλλως, nothing can be more repugnant. *Simon Peter* maketh this confession of *Christ*: [q] *Thou art Christ the Sonne of the liuing God.* The Diuell likewise maketh this confession of *Christ*, [r] *Thou art the Sonne of the Most High.* The same confession in the sense of words, but not in the intention of the speakers: for *Peter* confessed, that he might confirm others in the faith; and the Diuel did it, that he being priuileged to preach, might seduce mē from the truth. And so it might haue been presumed, that *M. Reinolds* vsed *S. Peters* words, but not in *S. Peters* sense; which was to dignifie such an *humane creature*, as to teach the ordeiner man in all temporall condition [*subditi estote*] *to be subiect*: but in his owne sense which followeth in the next Chapter, to abase that humane ordinance, teaching Subiects to depose their Princes. What is the difference? The generall scope of *S. Peter* is *subiection*, the aime of *M. Reinolds* is *rebellion.* This is heereby most plaine, because *S. Peter* writ his sentence in the dayes of *Nero* a most cruell and sauage Tyrant, and notwithstanding doth not incite Christian people or others to betake themselues vnto armes to depose *Nero*. But *M. Reinolds* holdeth it to be [f] *naturam generosiorem*, .i. *a more generous & noble disposition*, to kill Tyrants. Amongst whom he recounteth for *England*, *K.* [t] *Henry the Eight*. By al which it may appeare, that though not the place alleged, yet the scope of his whole booke doth conuince him of rebellious doctrine: as will more largely appeare in the *Incounter*. In the interim, let euery Christian learne, that that Gouernour whom *S. Peter* calleth a creature of man, *S. Paul* calleth [u] *the ordinance of God*: and both of them, after that Kings be once established by consent of the Common-wealth, doe require in all temporall causes an vnuiolable subiection vnto them without violent resistance, teaching that they are more than mans creatures, because he that resisteth them resisteth the ordinance of God.

[q] Matth. 16.

[r] Marc. 5. 7.

[f] Reinolds in his *Rosæo. cap. 2. pag. 62.* speaking of such Tyrants not as are inuaders of a coūtrey, but those who haue beene iustly possessed of their Kingdomes.

[t] Pag 135. Traiterous doctrine.

[u] Rom. 13. Apostolicall doctrine of subiection.

The fift obiection of falshood, whereupon hee insulteth thus: *Consider, I pray you, how may frauds and falshoods there be in one little quotation.*

120 P. R. preferreth another indictment against mee, thus; * *But will you heare a case or two more out of the Canon law, how dexterous Sir Tho. is in corrupting that which he loueth not, nor seemeth well to vnderstand. You may read in the 4. page of this his pamphlet* (the Discouery) *an ancient decree (for so he calleth it) alleged by him out of* Gratian *in the glosse, determining that though a man haue sworne to pay money to one that is excommunicated, yet is he not bound to pay the same, and he allegeth the Latine text thus*: Si iuraui me soluturum alicui pecuniam, qui excommunicatur, non teneor ei soluere: *If I haue sworne to pay money to any man that is excommunicated, I am not bound to pay it, adding this reason:* Quia qualitercunque possumus, debemus vexare malos, vt cessent a malo: *We ought to vex euill mē by what meanes so euer we may, to the end they may cease from doing euill. In the allegation of which little text, a man would hardly beleeue how many false trickes there be, to make Catholike doctrine to seeme odious and absurd. For first, these words not being found in any text of law or decision of any Pope or Councell, but only in the glosse or Commentary, they make not any ancient or modern decree, as the Minister falsly auoucheth, but rather shew the opinion of him who writeth the Commentary: if his words were, as heere they are alleged.* The causes. *First, the words of the glosse containe onely an obiection in these words: What if I haue sworne to pay money to any person, or haue promised the same vnder some forfeiture, and in the meane space he, to whom I made the promise, be excommunicated, am I bound to pay the same, or not? This is his question, and then he argueth it on both sides: but his resolution is in these words, I doe beleeue the truer opinion to be, that albeit he that is so excōmunicated, do leese the right to demand his money, yet is the other bound to pay it him. And for this he citeth diuers lawes and reasons. So heere our Minister not of ignorance, but of falshood taketh the obiection for the resolution. The second deceit is wilfull leauing out of the first words of the Authour,* Sed quid dices si iuraui? *which plainly*

* Treatise *Mitig.* cap. 2. num. 49. pag. 82.

» *plainly shew an obiection. Thirdly he alleged*, Quia qualitercunq; » &c. *for a reason of the resolution, which is made against that rea-* » *son. Fourthly the true resolution of the Commentator is vtterly* » *concealed, and the contrary determination put downe for an ancient* » *decree. Consider, I pray you, how many frauds and falshoods there* » *be in one little quotation.*

The Answer.

121 My Aduersary *P. R.* may satisfie himselfe for me, who a little after concerning this same allegation of this Author hath said that [b], *It may seeme to import that hee* (T.M.) *scarce read the bookes themselues, but cited the same out of some other mans notes.* Heere, we see, in his vehement crimination of malicious falshood, he hath inserted a charitable and true diuination of my integrity. I am glad to see in the mingling of a pound of worme-wood, and ten ounces of gall, hee had the grace to let fall this dram of sugar, and that so seasonably: For the truth is that I tooke vp these allegations of *Gratian* vpon credit, and therefore returne these peeces vnto him, of whom I receiued them: who is to prooue them currant, and to satisfie for himselfe.

[b] *Mitig.* pa. 84. num. 52.

122 Thus then he: [c] *This allegation, with some others, I* Ric. St. *brought vnto the Author of the* Discouery, *which* P. R. *chalengeth to be maliciously cited, partly for that the words of the glosse were only set downe, when the decree is mentioned: wherein I conceiue* P. R. *complaineth no otherwise, than one, who being smitten with the scabbard, should complaine that he was not struck with the sword: So he, because* T.M. *talked of the decree, and vrged only the glosse. For the decree is far more plaine against them than the glosse,* Nos sanctorum prædestinatorum statuta tenentes, eos, qui excommunicatis fidelitate aut Sacramento constricti sunt, apostolica authoritate à iuramento absoluimus: & nè sibi fidelitatem obseruent, omnibus modis prohibemus, quousque ipsi ad satisfactionem veniant. *This is the decree, which in the generall carrieth as much or more, as is set downe by him, and so cleereth him from any malice in this point. Besides, in the very glosse it selfe, (though it was not so fullie*

[c] *M. Stock*, a learned Preacher in *London* answereth for himselfe.

brought

brought to his hand) is set downe not by way of obiection, but of a resolute conclusion. For after the obiection and answer the conclusion is: Probabiliter dici potest, quòd excommunicato non sit soluendum, cum nemo debeat participare cum eo. *Yea and further, that in this he was not led by malice, is prooued thus: because he left out another more waighty allegation which was deliuered him with this, namely, out of* Greg. Decret. lib. 5. Tit. c. 18. Absolutos se nouerint à debito fidelitatis, dominij, & totius obsequij, quicunq; lapsus manifestè in hæresin aliquo pacto quacunq; firmitate vallato tenebantur astricti. *Now the glosse particularly and expresly for the present purpose hath it thus:* Ergo si sub pœna aliquis tenetur soluere certa die, & non soluat, non incidit in pœnam: & eodem modo si per iuramentum, quod & verum est argumentum quòd Papa potest absoluere laicum à iuramento fidelitatis, quoniam ad ipsum spectat interpretatio iuramenti: in illa autem obligatione & iuramento tacitè subintelligitur, si talis permanserit, cui communicare liceat. *Which decree and Glosse doth a great deale more strongly smell of that impietie, teaching that a man is not bound in such a case to pay his debt: and yeelding to the Pope a power of absoluing men from such like obligations.* Thus farre *R. S.*

123 By which Answer of *R. S.* wee may perceiue that the tenor of the Popes Canon in the outward letter doth denie the paiment of debts: and the glosse it selfe concludeth a *probability of non paiment*, which being applied by Romish Priests vnto Protestants in the name of *Excommunicats*, it is but an hazzard whether Protestants (except it bee by the vigour of law) shall recouer their debts. Which I prooued in the next testimonie out of their Cardinall *Tollet*, expounding the forme Canon. I prooued that their ordinary Tenet is in that case, [a] *Not to pay any debt, which consisteth only in promise.* Wherein my Reader may discerne an argument of my sincerity, because I would not allege the Canons in their generality *of not paying any debt*, though it might haue made my Aduersaies more odious; but chose rather the Comment of *Tollet*, in the restraint and limitation *for not paying debt of onely promise.* This my intire, and in a maner partiall dealing in behalfe of my Ad-

[a] Non tenentur reddere rē verbis contractam. Card. *Tollet* lib 1. Instruct. Sacerd. ca. 13. § *Sextus* in his last edition.

An vndoubted argument of the Autors sincerity.

 uersaries,

verſaries, F. R. cannot bee ignorant of; and yet ſpareth not to ſpot me with his cõmon note of malicious lies. There followeth

A ſixt obiection of falſhood, with this inſultation: *Let the iudicious Reader conſider how many falſe tricks and corruptions this crafty Miniſter hath vſed.*

• Mtig. cap. 2. num. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. pag. 84.

» 1214. F. R. hath another Article againſt me, thus; • *In the ſixt page of his Diſcouery, he hath this grieuous accuſation out of the Canon law againſt vs.* Haereticis ſiſti, vel conſanguineorum dicuntur, ſecundum leges, ſummus rus ſuper eos, vt haurias ſanguinem ipſorum. *And there he quoteth thus: apud Grat. gloſſ. in decret. lib. 5. tit. Decret. Gregor. 9. cauſ. 23. q. 8. cap. 1. egi.* » *Which diſmembred kinde of quotation, ſeparating the firſt and laſt words, that ſhould haue gone together, ſeemes to import that her ſeuerall and the booke at large ſolues, but yet edicho ſeems ouer-offended* » *her owne matter; but that fault were eaſily pardoned, if ſhee vſed no* » *greater fraud in the thing it ſelfe. For firſt the Engliſh bible hath words* » *in the margent: Heretikes may not bee termed either children,* » *or kindred, but according to the old law, thy hand muſt be vpa-* » *gainſt them to ſpill their bloud. And then in the margent ſhe* » *ſetteth downe this ſpeciall print of mine.* The profeſſed bloudy maſ-» *ſacre againſt the Proteſtants, without diſtinction of ſexe or* » *kindred. And what cauſe more euidently vrgeth them thus? Now* » *then let vs ſee how many falſe tricks and ſhifts fit for a Proteſtant* » *Miniſter, in the darking in this ſilent cytation. Firſt this gloſſe or* » *Commentary of the Canon-lawe vpon the Canon beginning Sequuntur,* » *which Canon is taken out of the third Councell of Carthage, &c.* » *Secondly, he hath left out the beginning of the gloſſe. Thirdly, hee* » *addeth hereunto, vt fundas ſanguinem, which the gloſſe hath* » *not. And now let the iudicious Reader conſider how many cor-* » *ruptions this crafty Miniſter hath vſed to bring foorth to his purpoſe* » *this one little diſtracted text for proofe of profeſſed bloudy maſſa-* » *cres intended by vs againſt Proteſtants: wherein firſt by peruer-* » *ting the very words of God himſelfe in the Law, by tranſlating, vt* » *fundas ſanguinem ipſorum, ſpill their bloud, inſtead of, ſhed* » *their bloud: although God wrote a bloud-ſpiller, or commanded* » *the ſame to be vniuerſally done by others. By this one (leſt the reſt*

but

that one by one of all the particulars of this proceeding. Thus ”
saith R. S.

The Answer.

125 To the allegation of this place of *Gratian*, R. S. doth owe you an answer, which hee hath performed in these words: *This second place also I brought* (saith hee) *out of* T. M. *the whole being no otherwise distractedly quoted, then the gloſſe, whence I had it, warranted by me. For that if* P. R. *reprooue me, he muſt checke his gloſſary: for when the gloſſe had ſet down the firſt part, he quoted for the latter, causa* 23. *q.* 8. *cap. legi, meaning in the decrees where it is, Sic manus tua ſuper eos, vt fundas ſanguinem ipſorum.* ¶ M. Stock.

126 So hath he ſatisfied for his allegation. It remaineth that I likewiſe iuſtifie both my collection and tranſlation. For the firſt, I would demand of P. R. if, Romiſh ones applying this Canon of *Murdering their kindred, &c.* againſt Proteſtants, when the Pope ſhall iudicially denounce them Heretikes, whether it may bee called a maſſacre, or no? I haue now my *Mitigator* vpon a Logicke racke, either he muſt ſay that it is no bloudy maſſacre, but Catholike iuſtice: and then what ſhall his Reader think vpon his *Mitigation* otherwiſe than a *Iudas* his lips in betraying his Maſter? If he ſhall hold it an execrable miſchiefe, then how ſhall he iuſtifie the application of this canon, when the Pope ſhall extend it againſt Proteſtants? He cannot anſwer directly, but hee muſt manifeſt himſelfe either a Traitor to his Country, or a prouaricator to his cauſe. A dilemma.

127 His other reaſon is vpon my interpretation, *Vt fundas ſanguinem, to ſpill their blood, in ſtead* (ſaith he) *of ſhed their blood.* Why ſo? becauſe *otherwiſe*, (the man may ſeeme to haue ſome pious and religious deuotion in him) *God ſhould be ſaid to be a blood-ſpiller.* And muſt it therefore be rather tranſlated, *ſhed?* why, ſo *God* ſhould bee ſaid to bee *a blood-ſhedder.* I marueil what new Dictionary (for he is altogether verbal) P. R. doth follow. I hope that ſo profound a Clerke will not want a reaſon of his ſubtilty: let vs heare him. *To ſpill blood* (ſaith hee) *doth ſignifie an vniuſt deed.* Is this it? as though *ſhedding of blood* might not likewiſe ſignify an *vniuſt deed.* Let him conſult with their

their own Remish translation, *Rom.* 3. 15. *Their feet* (viz. of the wicked) *are swift to shed blood.* And *Act.* 22. 20. *When the blood of the Martyr Stephen was shed.* And *Apoc.* 16. 6. *They haue shed the blood of the Saints, therefore hast thou giuen them blood to drinke.* And *Luc.* 11. 50. *That the blood of the Prophets shed from the beginning of the world may be required of this generation.* Will *P. R.* haue the face to say, that the *blood of the Martyr Stephen*, and of the *Prophets* by the *Iewes*, or of the *blood of Saints* by the Heathen was *shed iustly?* Againe, the Rhemists *Mark.* 2. 22. *No man putteth new wine into old bottles, otherwise the wine breaketh the bottles, and the wine will be shed.* This is spoken of the wine, which being shed perisheth. So is it vulgarly vsed, [drinke is spilt, and drinke is shed.] Now then what a notable Critick haue I met withall, whom euery good-wife is able to conuince of idle dotage? But this is a man priuiledged to send me to the Vniuersitie to make a Syllogisme, whom I may more iustly send vnto an Ale-house to learne English.

P. R. his babish foolery.

128 The last point, which is obseruable in our *Mitigator*, is, that he affirmeth this Canon to haue beene decreed in the 3. Councell of *Carthage*, where no such thing can be found. Therefore must his owne termes of *falshood, fraud, treacherie*, reuerberate vpon himselfe. And yet againe we may consider how zealous *P. R.* is in authorizing that Canon, and in vrging the text of Scripture, saying, *If thy brother, or friend, or wife will goe about to destroy the truth, let thy hand be vpon him.* To what end must all this be, but that Protestants, being in their opinion heretikes, may haue all the penalties which are awarded against heretikes executed vpon them (as *Bonchier* and others defend) *before*, or at least (as *P. R.* holdeth) *after denunciation of sentence?* And consequently Protestants may be, by these Romish ones, without exception of sex, or kindred, or friendship, as it was by execution in the cruell *Massacre* in [h] *France*, and by intention in the *Powder-treason*, vtterly consumed at once. Which being performed, the* Conspiracie shal be called an holy *League* the Actour a zealous *Ahod*, the Act a *Sacrifice*. All which proceedeth from a false and perfidious application both

g Reade *Surius* vpon that Councel. *tom.* 1. *Conc.*

h See *Thuanus hist. lib.* 52.

* This I shall proue in the *Incounter* out of *Bonchier*.

both of the Scripture, and of the Canon. For the law of *Deuteronomy* mentioneth such transgressions, *Who shall intice thee, saying, Let vs go and serue other gods, which thou hast not knowen, nor thy fathers before thee.* And the Canon was directed only against such heretikes, who did ruinate the foundation of Christian faith. But Protestants are so farre from idolatrie, that for feare thereof, they haue (in the dayes of *Q. Marie*) yeelded their bodies to the fire; so farre from heresie, that they are ready to seale euery fundamental Article of faith with their blood.

A seuenth obiection of falshood, wherein he insulteth, saying: *Seeing hee hath corrupted a text of Scripture, you may thinke what libertie hee will take afterward thorowout his whole booke.*

129 I haue already answered vnto this calumniation, shewing, that both the English text, the Latine Commentaries, the Hebrew Originall, and the confession of their owne Doctour doe free me from all suspition of *corruption*: wherein our Reader may imagine, whether *P. R.* by obiecting the Hebrew text, hath not deserued the title of an ebrition. [i] See aboue §. 5. pag. 12.

An eighth obiection of falshood, wherein he insulteth in this maner: *Thus much for his varietie of corruptions in this little sentence.*

130 *P. R.* pretermitting (as his maner is) such points wherein he saw the Romish Arguments most forcibly confuted, insisteth only vpon such, wherein hee thinketh his abilitie will serue to make some sensible resistance. Therefore hee sayth: [k] *To the end you may see his Talent* (in deducing proofs out of Romish Writers) *wee shall examine only the third Reason in this place, which he declareth in these words*: Except, sayth the Romish pretence, there were a way of deposing Apostata Princes, God had not prouided sufficiently for his Church, *And for this he citeth the* Constitution extrauagant *of Pope* Bonifacius, *and sayth*, This obiection is in your extrauagants, and so it may be called, because it rangeth *extra, that is*, without the bonds. [k] Treatise *Mitig.* cha. 5. num. 43. pag. 174. *Extrau. com. de mai. & obed. § vnã Sanctam.*

» bonds of Gods ordinance, &c. *But as in all his other citations*
» *generally hee is neuer lightly true and sincere in all points, no not*
» *thrice (I thinke verily) thorowout all this lying booke of his, so nei-*
» *ther heere: and it would require a great volume alone to examine*
» *only some part of his leasings about this point of his shifts and cor-*
» *ruptions, they are so many and thick, and craftily huddled vp toge-*
» *ther. As for example heere: First, this sentence is not in the Popes*
» Extrauagant *at all, but only in a certeine addition to the ordinarie*
» *Glosse or Commentarie of* Io. Picard, *which addition was made*
» *by* Petrus Bertrandus *a late Writer. Secondly, this Comment*
» *sayth nothing of deposing of Apostata Princes, but only affirming*
» *the foresayd opinion of Canonists to be true,* That Christ was
» Lord absolutely in this life ouer all, not only in spirituall au-
» thority, but in temporall also: *he inferreth thereby, That Christ*
» *should not haue sufficiently prouided for the gouernment of his*
» *Church and Kingdome vpon earth,* Nisi vnicum post se talem
» Vicarium reliquisset, qui hæc omnia posset: *except he had left*
» *some such one Substitute or Vicar after him, as should be able to*
» *performe all these things, to wit, as belong both to spirituall and*
» *temporall power, according as necessitie shall require. Which lat-*
» *ter clause you see that T. M. hath cut off, as he added the other*
» *of* Apostata Princes. *And thus much for his variety of corrupti-*
» *ons in this little sentence. Now to the thing it selfe.* So farre *P. R.*

Addit. ad Com. Extra. de Mat. in c. 1. ad fin.

The Answer.

131 If I had not purposed to set downe *little sentences*, I am sure my Aduersarie his sentences and censures could not haue beene so great: where breuity (which I thought would be most gratefull to any iudicious Reader) is inuerted vpon me by a calumnious Aduersary as most preiudiciall to my cause. First, for citing the *Extrauagants* of the Pope, whereby an ingenuous Reader would haue vnderstood a figure *Synecdoche*, where the part is put for the whole; as when wee say, This man shall not come vnder my *roofe*; meaning by *roofe*, which is but a part of the house, the whole house it selfe: So heere by *Extrauagant* might haue been meant the whole body of these Constitutions, which containe both *Extrauagants* and *Glosses*:

which

which is heerein found to be most consonant, because Pope [1] *Gregory* 13. hath ratified the foresayd *Glosse* and *Annotations* with priuilege and authority equipollent and answerable to the authorities of the *Decretals* and *Extrauagants* themselues. If, hearing one of *P. R.* his scholars make a Syllogisme, like that which *P. R.* himselfe framed, which hath neither mood nor figure, & this likewise had been approued by him, some should presently say to the boy, Sirra, this is *P. R.* his Syllogisme; I do not thinke that *P. R.* would call him a lier.

[1] Gregor. 13. ad futuræ rei memoriam. Reliquum est, vt eiusde Decreti vnà cum Annotationibus prædictis tàm absq; Glossis, quàm ipsum totum cùm Glossis, Sextumque & Clementinas simul & extrauagantes à dilecto filio S. E. recognoscenda omnia & approbanda &c. imprimi & impressa diuulgari iussimus, ac ad maiorem Christi fidelium vbiq; commorantium commoditatem, hoc in his Canonici corpus fidelibus & integrè iuxta exemplar Romæ impressum, imprimi possit. Nos opportunè prouidere volentes, vt hoc in Canonicum sic expurgatum ad omnes vbiq; Christi fideles sartum tectum perueniat, ac ne cuiquam liceat eidem operi quicquam addere, vel immutare, aut inuertere, nullaue interpretamenta adiungere, &c.

THE second *P. R.* might haue answered for me, That the words, *Apostaticall Princes*, were not my *Addition*, but the obiection of my Aduersary the *Moderate Answerer*, as may appeare by *P. R.* his owne relation. And when I sayd, That *the same obiection was in the extrauagants*, I could not thinke that any Aduersary euer could haue seene either by reason of ignorance so grosse, or by malice so peruerse, as to affect, that the obiection be found in the place *totidemverbis*: for so there should be no end of cauilling, but be contented to finde it in the true sense: which sense euen this my Accuser doth plainly acknowledge, laying (as we haue heard) this same *Extrauagant* as the ground of Gods prouidence in the Pope (his supposed Vicar of Christ) by whose power *spirituall* and *temporall, any Prince, extirpating Christian religion*, may be remooued: which is no more than I sayd was contained in the *Extrauagants*. But such is the malignity of this *Mitigator*, that he will not allow in his Aduersarie, which he practiseth himselfe: and not he only, but euen the known canons of his Popes are guilty (if it be a guilt) of the same, citing the text of *Deut.* 17. & thus: *If there be a matter, or question vpon the controuersie of blood, or cause, or leprosie, arising within thy gates, thou shalt arise, and get thee vp into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, and thou shalt come to the Priests of the Leuiticall stock, and to the Iudge that shall be for the time, and thou shalt aske of them, and they shall shew thee the truth of the iudgement: and thou shalt do whatsoeuer they shall say, which are in the place which the Lord shall choose, and they shall teach thee all things according to his law, and thou shalt follow their sentence, neither shalt thou decline to the right hand or to the left.* Now if this be not a plaine Text for the Popes infallible Chaire, I know not what is. And yet this is the Text, which the Popes Canons haue alleaged for their infallibility, and which *P. R.* himselfe hath alleaged for the same purpose, in his Booke of Schisme, pag. 86. and 87. Now if *P. R.* may alleage Scripture for the Popes infallibility, why may not I alleage the Popes Canons for his Apostacy? Is not this iniustice

= Treatise Mitig. ca. 2. n. 55. pag. 86.

tice thee saying, *let vs goe serue strange Gods*, &c. But these words, *Depraue the truth*, &c. are not to be found; yet because they containe the true sense I should thinke it impiety either in another or in my selfe, to note (as he doth me) his Canons, and consequently his Popes of *lying shifts and corruptions*.

P. R. his accusation redounding vpon his Popes.

133 The last *shift* he findeth fault with, is. for cutting off the clause, *Nisi vnicum*. What needed any addition of that which was sufficiently expressed in my Aduersaries obiection, and by me acknowledged to bee contained in the *Extranagants*, as we haue heard? If there bee any shift in my citation, I must confesse it thus: viz. the not adding these words of that glosse, *Iesus de iure naturali in Imperatorem, & quascunque alios depositionis sententiam ferre potuisset, & damnationis, & quascunque alias, &c. & eadem ratione vicarius eius potest*. That is, *As Iesus by his naturall right might enter into iudgement, and pronounce sentence of deposing an Emperour, or any other person: So may* (meaning the Pope) *Christs vicar also*. This is the Popish glosse, and the ground of those Romish & rebellious positions, which I did discouer, and which prouoketh our *Mitigatour* an excellent shifter, who saith that heere was nothing said *of deposing Apostata Princes*, to the end his Reader might conceiue my Answer to haue beene altogether impertinent. But I pray you *P. R.* can *Apostata* Princes be excepted, where *All Princes and Emperours* are included? But I will not vrge against my selfe the former omission of the foresaid sentence of the glosse. I know *P. R.* will too easily pardon me this fault.

A fond cauill.

A ninth obiection of falshood, therein insulting thus: } *A witting and a manifest lie, and cosenage. His Latine words were perfidiously alleged.*

134 *P. R.* obiecteth thus: „ *He* (Thomas Morton) *alleggeth the* „ *words of Bellarmine thus*: Dum rem ipsam excutio, non facilè „ audeo pronunciare illos in errore fuisse, *While I do examine well* „ *the thing it selfe, I dare not presume to pronounce them to haue* „ *beene in error, to wit*, Caluin *and* Beza; *whereas* Bellarmines „ *words are*, Dum rem ipsam excutio, & Caluini sententias dili- „ genter considero, non facilè audeo pronuntiare illum in hoc

a Treatise *Mitig.* cap. 6. num. 55. pag. 131.

errore

errore fuisse. *While I examine the matter it selfe, and diligently consider Caluins opinions, I do not easily presume to pronounce him to haue beene in this error: to wit, in the particular error on here-sie of the* Autotheans, *set downe and confuted by* Cinnebrard, *and in his sense condemned expresly by the ancient Catholike Church, for denying Christ to bee and to haue his essence from the Father: but yet though in some sense it seemeth to* Bellarmine, *that* Caluin *may be excused in this priuate and particular meaning of his, yet not absolutely, as* T. M. *would haue his Reader to thinke, by striking out cunningly the particle* hoc *(this error) and leaning the word* Errour *in common, as though* Bellarmine *had excused him from all kind of error, which is most false, for that presently after he both impugneth of purpose, and confuteth by many arguments his maner of speech as hereticall in this behalfe.* And againe: *So is his cosenage heerein in striking out* hoc *out of* Bellarmines *words: so, for the same purpose he turneth* illum *into* illos: *which he could not do but wittingly and of purpose, and yet the man forsooth will not equiuocate for the world, and yet will he lie for much lesse, as you see.* Thus *P. R.*

The Answer.

135 He would not wittingly lie for all the world, who would not for all the world equiuocate, lest hee might lie, as I feare he doth, who calleth this lapse of words [*Errore* and *illos*] *a perfidious cosenage*. For if I had been of so diuelish a disposition as to seek to cosen my Reader, then sure (according to the malice of the Diuell, who seeketh *whom he may deuour*, that is, to deuoure all) I should not haue left that Latine sentence vntranslated, but would haue Englished it, that by the Latin and English as by a double net my cosenage might haue beene, for the number of the seduced, farre more successfull: which considerations, I hope, may free me from wilfull falshood.

136 That there is also no falshood at all, the matter it selfe will shew. For our dispute was onely concerning this one suspected error of αὐτοθεϊσμοῦ, which many Iesuites and others, condemned as a *Paradox*, *a blasphemy*, *an atheisme*: against whom I opposed *Bellarmine* to acquit *Caluin ab errore*, that

A stupid cauill.

is, *from error*, (which is all one as if I had said *This error*) which is the proper and only matter in question. Let *P. R.* procure a suspected fellow to bee arraigned at the barre, whom the Iudge knoweth to be a drunkard, a prophane swearer, and a person adulterous: but the inditement preferred against him is only concerning felony: the witnesses are brought forth all circumstances are examined: in the end the Iudge perceiuing the presumptions to be friuolous, shall giue this iudgement, saying, Now that I haue heard the matter examined, I finde no fault in the man. By and by *P. R.* shall stand vp, saying, O Iudge thou knowest him to be a drunkard, a blasphemer and a lewd liuer, and canst thou find no fault with him? thou shouldest haue said, I find not *this fault of felony* in him; and therefore thou hast deliuered a *perfidious* and a *coseuing* sentence. Againe, when our Sauiour Christ said to his Disciples, [a] *Pray, &c. for the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weake*; would the Diuinity of *P. R.* correct the speech, and say, though it bee spoken of mankind, yet it is too generally deliuered, because there is a flesh of beasts, and a spirit of Diuels: and therefore should be more expresly set downe, *This kind of flesh*, and *this kinde of spirit?* *P. R.* sitteth at his table, and when he seeth two sorts of bread, fine manchet, and courser; and expressing that hee desireth rather the manner kinde, should say to one of his seruitors a Sophister, Sirra, giue me the courser bread: would hee (for want of mentioning *This bread on the Table*) allow his Sophister to runne into the stable, and bring him an horse loafe? Would he not rather whip him, for his insolency, if he would not; or for his follie, if he could not perceiue that when a man speaketh of *This* kinde of bread, which is before his face, it is all one as if he had said, *of this bread?* Such is my case, concerning which (as I professe) I could not be so absurdly subtle, as willingly to conceale *hoc*, so am I perswaded, that no aduersarie (I only except *P. R.*) could be so peruersly grosse, as to exact a particle *Hoc*, i. *This*, knowing that the matter in question was particularly *de hoc errore*, of this only error.

[a] Matt. 26.42.

Another friuolous cauill.

137 Although this last taxation be very idle, yet this second is (if I may so say) more friuolous, *illos* for *illum*, that is, *them*

them in steed of *him*. If *Bellarmine* iustifie *Caluin* for this opinion of *Autotheos*, doth he not likewise therein iustifie all other Protestants, which are of the same opinion? For if I condemne *P. R.* for a graceless Sophister, because of his defense of mentall equiuocation, do I not therein condemne all others, who are professed Æquiuocators? This is true, will *P. R.* say, yet the Authors word *illum*, should not haue beene changed into *illos*. This Aduersary, we see, is rigorous, I will appeale therefore vnto another Aduersary, whom I find more ingenuous, euen *Bellarmine* himselfe; who in the place alleged, after that he had said of *Caluin, I dare not say that he was in this error* doth in the same Chapter iustifie *Beza* also, and more expressly *Simlerus*, another Protestant, saying, *Non video cur hæc sententia Catholica dicenda non sit*, that is, *I see no cause why this sentence should not be thought Catholicall:* iustifying not only *illum*, that is, *Caluin*, but also *Beza* and *Simlerus*, which will make *illos*, euen in that opinion, which *Campian*, the *Rhemists*, their *Genebrard*, and others haue calumniously and wickedly called *a Paradox, an Heresie, a Blasphemy, an Atheisme.* Such is the blindnesse of their malice, which (God willing) I shall shew more fully in the *Incounter*.

A tenth obiection of falshood, with this insultation: *Is not this rather falshood than folly? where is his* naked innocency? *where is his* vpright conscience? *where is his* simplicity in Christ Iesus?

138 The matter is only for changing a title of the booke of *Carerius*, and altering the word *verò* into *verè*: but *trifles* (saith *P. R.*) *yet such as bewray a guilty minde and meaning.* But I haue shewed euidently, that I neither altered the title, nor the text, so that *P. R.* standeth chargeable to his Reader to satisfie for his owne mind and meaning, which must haue beene either giddily rash, or gracelesly false. ? See aboue §. 6. pag. 15.

A

An eleuenth obiection of falshood, with this insultation: *How can this malicious cauilling Minister expect to bee trusted heereafter? or how may any thinke, that he writeth from his conscience, seeing him vse such grosse shifts and falshoods in so important a matter?*

[a] See aboue §. 7. pag. 22. nú. 23. 24. 25. &c.

139 I [a] haue discussed this obiection already: the point is concerning the testimony of *Doleman*, because it was not cited in the very literall words, although (as I haue manifestly euinced) it was deliuered according to the reall and demonstratiue sense. And if such accusations might preuaile, then might *P. R.* (but I hope he will not be so blasphemous) accuse the diuine Oracles of God, the holy Scriptures, where the Apostles citing the testimonies of the old Testament, doe not commonly allege the words, but the sense: As *Ephes.* 5. 14. *Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall giue thee light.* The words [*He saith*] signifie God speaking in Scripture, yet not by manifestation of words, but by collection and comprehension of sense. There be many such like places, as *Heb.* 1. 1. *Heb.* 3. 5. *Act.* 10. 43. Nay himselfe and their owne Popish Canon (as [r] hath beene shewen) haue alleged the text of *Deuteronomie*, but not according to expresse words, although not disagreeable from the true sense. And may Popes thus presume in alleging of Gods truth, and may not man make as bold with mans testimonie, so that still there be no deprauation of the true sense?

An impious cauill.

[r] See a little before in this §. num. 132.

A twelfth obiection of falshood, wherupon he thus insulteth: *Consider how falsly and calumniously this Make-bate doth reason: will hee not bee ashamed to see himselfe condemned of so great ouerlashing?*

140 The question is about the hinderance of the due succession of a Protestant prince vnto his crowne: This *P. R.* indeuoured to condemne by a *triple instance*, and [f] hath himselfe beene confuted both by his owne Doctours, and also by a triple instance taken from himselfe.

[f] See aboue §. 7. pag. 19. nú. 21, &c.

A thirteenth obiection of falshood, with this spightfull insultation: *Hee allegeth* Frisingensis *quite contrary to his owne meaning. Is this the* assurance of his vpright consсience, *whereof he braggeth so much?*

141 In this cauill about the testimonie of *Frisingensis* P. R. hath played foure treacherous parts, that he might (though falsly) conuince me of one: as hath beene already [t] prooued. Yet in this, together with that which followeth, he triumpheth more than of any taxation he hath in the whole booke.

[t] See aboue §. 8.

A foureteenth and most rigorous obiection of falshood, with this insultation: *It is a fraud and impudencie, or rather impudent impietie, a slandrous obiection, shamelesse dealing. Will euer any man credit T. M. heereafter?*

142 I am ready to heare this grand crimination of P. R. who beginneth thus: [u] *But the next fraud or impudencie, or rather impudent impietie, is that which insueth within foure lines after, in these words:* Pope Gregorie the seuenth (sayth your Chronologer) was excommunicate of the Bishops of Italie, for that he had defamed the Apostolike See by Symonie, and other capitall crimes. *And then citeth for proofe heereof,* Lambertus Scaffnaburg. Anno 1077. *As if this our Chronographer had related this as a thing of truth, or that it were approoued by him, and not rather a slanderous obiection cast out by his Aduersaries that followed the part of* Henrie *the Emperor. Let any man reade the place and yeere heere cited, and if hee be a modest man he will blush at such shamelesse dealing. For that no Author of that time doth more earnestly defend the cause and vertuous life of* Pope Hildebrand, *then this man, whose words are:* Sed apud omnes sanum aliquid sapientes luce clarius constabat falsa esse quæ dicebantur: Nam & Papa tàm eximiè támque Apostolicè vitam instituebat, &c. *But with all men of sound wisedome it was more cleere then the Sunne, that the things which were spoken against* Pope Hildebrand *were false, for that the*

[u] Treat. Mitig. ca. 6. num. 37. pag. 215.

Lq. Staff. hist. Germ. ann. 1077. sub fin.

» Pope did lead an excellent and Apostolike life, as the sublimitie of
» his conuersation did admit no least spot of wicked rumour against
» him, he liuing in that great citie and open concourse of men, it could
» not haue beene hidden, if he had committed any vnlawfull thing in
» his life: and moreouer the signes and miracles, which by his pray-
» ers were often-times done, and his most feruent zeale for God in
» defence of Ecclesiasticall lawes did sufficiently defend him against
» the poisoned tongues of his detractors. And againe: Hildebrandi
» constantia & inuictus aduersus auaritiam animus omnia ex-
» cludebat argumenta humanæ fallaciæ: The constancie of Pope
» Hildebrand and his invincible minde against the corruption of a-
» uarice, did exclude all arguments of humane fallacie and deceit.
» So Lambertus. And now let the reader consider with what con-
» science and fidelitie T. M. hath cited him for condemnation of Pope
» Hildebrand. Hee relateth indeed what certaine noblemen, cap-
» taines, and others, that came with the Emperour to the castle of
» Canusium, and would not haue had him made peace with the Pope
» in that place, faide in their rage afterwards, for that against their
» counsell he had submitted himselfe vnto the said Pope: and when a
» certaine Bishop named Eppo was sent to their campe by the Pope
» and Emperour to enforme them of the agreement and submission
» made; Fremere omnes (saith this story) & insanire, verbis &
» manibus coeperunt, Apostolicæ legationi irrisorijs exclamati-
» onibus obstrepere, conuicia & maledicta turpissima quæcunq;
» furor suggessisset, irrogare. All of them began to fret and wax
» fierce both in words and casting their hands, and with scornefull
» outcries to contradict this holy Apostolical legation sent vnto them,
» and to cast vpon the Pope all the most foule reproches and maledi-
» ctions that furie could suggest vnto them. Thus saith Lambertus,
» and setteth downe the particular slanderous reproches heere cited
» by T. M. which he approoueth not, but condemneth, as you haue
» heard, and highly commendeth not onely the vertue but also the
» sanctitie of the Pope. And will euer any man credit T. M. any more
» in any thing that he alledgeth, when this conscienceleſſe falsifi-
» cation is once discouered in him? yea though it were but once
» therewout his whole booke, it were sufficient to proone that he dea-
» leth not out of any faith or conscience at all. If an enemie would dis-

Lamb. vbi sup.

credit

credit both Christ, and Christian religion, and say, your own Euan- »
gelists doe recount sonte things against him (as heere this Mini- »
ster saith our Historiographer doth of Pope Gregorie) and name- »
ly that he was accused by the Scribes and Pharisees for casting out »
Diuels by the power of Beelzebub, for deceiuing the people, for »
denying tribute to be paid to Cæsar, for mouing sedition, and other »
like crimes, which our Euangelists doe recount indeed, but do con- »
demne them as false and calumnious; were not this as good and as »
faithfull a maner of reasoning, as this other of Thomas Morton »
out of Lambertus *and* Frisingensis *against Pope* Hildebrond, »
who is by them both most highly commended as you heard, and his »
aduersaries condemned? Truly if any man can shew me out of all the »
Catholike writers that be extant, English or other, that euer any »
of them vsed this shamefull fraud in writing, wherein no excuse can »
free them from malicious and witting falshood, then will I grant »
that this is not proper to the Protestant spirit alone. Hitherto I »
must confesse that I neuer found it in any, and if I should, though it »
were but once, I should hold it for a sufficient argument not to be- »
leeue him euer after. And this shall suffice for a taste only of M. »
Mortons *maner of proceeding, for that to prosecute all particulars* »
would require a whole volume, and by this few you may guesse at »
the mans veine and spirit in writing. Hitherto *P. R.* »

The Answer.

143 Thou seest (Christian Reader) I haue had patience to heare my indictment deliuered vnto the full, and suffered my Aduersarie without any interruption to say so much in this accusation, as that by this time he may seeme to haue run himselfe out of breath. For what could either the dexteritie of Art, or the violence of passion force more, then to note his Aduersarie of so *shamelesse falshood*, as to be without comparison *maliciously fraudulent*, and vtterly vnworthy *to be credited euer any more in any thing that he alleadgeth?* Now therefore I turne my selfe vnto thee (good Reader) as to my Iudge, who may seeme by this time to exact of me an Answer; and of whom I must desire and expect a iust censure. Vouchsafe therefore (I pray thee) an inuentiue examination, and I dare

presume

presume thou wilt acknowledge this Accusation to be both so false and fooliſh, and vnfortunate to his cauſe; and indeed blaſphemous, as though he had ſtudied to be either faithleſſe, or fond, or vnlucky, or impious.

I. *The falſitie of this crimination.*

144 In the beginning I am charged with *impudent impietie* for citing *Lambert Scaffnaburg* to affirme that *The Biſhops of Italy did excommunicate Pope Gregorie for capitall crimes.* But why is this *impudency? As if* (ſaith *P. R.*) *this our Chronographer had related this as a thing of trueth, or that it were approoued of him, and not rather as a ſlanderous obiection caſt out by his Aduerſaries that followed the part of* Henrie *the Emperor, &c.* The point now in queſtion is, whether this Author *Lambertus Scaffnaburg* did thinke that thoſe *Biſhops of Italy* had condemned this Pope *Gregory* (for whether they did it iuſtly or vniuſtly is the ſecond queſtion) for ſuch crimes or no; I haue affirmed that *Lambertus Scaffnaburg* was of this opinion: but *P. R.* denieth it, calling my aſſertion an *impudent impietie.* Let vs be iudged by the euidence of the Author himſelfe: who in the place alledged hath theſe words: *Poſtquam per Italiam fama percrebuiſſet, &c. After that the fame was ſpred abroad thorowout Italy, that K.* Henry *had ſet his foote in their coaſts; [certatim omnes Italiæ Epiſcopi, &c] All the Biſhops of Italy did flocke by troupes vnto him, receiuing him with all honour woorthie the magnificence of ſuch a perſon, and within a few daies after an armie of an infinite multitude was gathered vnto him: for from the firſt time that he was King, they longed for his comming into Italy, becauſe at this time Italy was peſtered with theeuery.* And what els? It followeth a little after. *Beſides, they* (viz. the Biſhops and people) *did congratulate his comming, becauſe it was reported that he came with a reſolute courage to depoſe* (Gregory) *the Pope.* Heere we ſee it granted by *Lambert* that *All the Biſhops of Italy* were deſirous to haue this Pope *Gregory depoſed.* But after all this the Emperour goeth to Rome, ſeeketh abſolution of the Pope, returneth backe againe, and the Biſhop *Eppo* is ſent after to ſignifie to the Italians this ſubmiſſion

to

to the Pope. What now? Now followeth the testimony which was alledged: *Qui cùm causam Italis exposuisset, &c. When Eppo had told his message to the Italians, all of them began to rage and fret, &c. casting vpon the Pope all opprobrious reproches, whom all the Bishops of Italy had before iustly excommunicated, because by Simonie he had defiled the sea Apostolike.* Could this Chronologer but acknowledge that the Pope had beene excommunicated by the Bishops of Italy, who (as he confessed in the beginning) did *reioice at the comming of the Emperour, because he came with a resolution to depose the Pope?* Which is a thing so notoriously knowne, that neuer Author did denie it: Insomuch that *Binius* their last and best authorized Compiler of the Councels, an Author wholly deuoted to that Sea of Rome, confesseth that [x] Anno 1076. (viz. the yeere before this happened, which hath beene related out of *Lambert*) *In the Councell of Papia, a city in Italy, the Bishops gathered themselues together, and excommunicated the Pope.* Although he call that *Councell, Conciliabulum*, and the Bishops *Schismaticos, Schismatikes*, as peraduenture *Lambert* also did esteeme them; yet this trueth is acknowledged of all, that *The Bishops of Italy did excommunicate this Pope.* Which is all that either hath, or needed to haue been said. And could this deserue so rigorous a censure of *impudent impietie*, and whatsoeuer bitternesse the gall of this man could vent out? I proceed to the second point, which is

[x] Binius tom. 3. Conc. pag. 1281.

II. *The foolishnesse of his Accusation.*

145 That being granted, which neuer any Historian did denie, that *The Bishops of Italie did excommunicate Gregorie*, alias *Hildebrand*, and sought by the power of the Emperor *Henrie* to haue him deposed: the sottishnesse of the second obiection will bewray it selfe at the first hearing, to wit, The Authour *Lambertus* condemneth such proceedings against the Pope, and *highly commendeth not only the vertue, but also the sanctitie of the Pope*: And therefore *will any man credit* T. M. *any more?* Yes, I hope, any who shall rightly discerne the reason of my allegation. For my proofe, taken from the testi-

monie of this *Lambertus*, consisteth not in his censure of *commending*, or of *discommending* the proceedings of the Italian Bishops against the Pope, but in the iudgement of those Italian Bishops, who all (as *Lambertus* confesseth) wished that that Pope might be deposed. A collection vsed of all men in the citing of all Chronologers, knowing that the proper office of an Historian is to be a witnesse of things done, and not a Iudge. For if any fauourite of my *Mitigator* should report, saying thus, That *P. R.* (I doe but suppose this) was expelled out of a College of *Oxford* by the Fellowes, who did censure him for some misdemeanour; but yet I thinke (saith his fauourite) that the Fellowes did him wrong: For I haue heard him to haue beene accounted by others of very commendable conuersation. Then presently some by-stander should make bold to giue out that the Felowes of a College in *Oxford* did so censure *P. R.* and name his Author; could any say that he had abused that testimonie, because he gaue more credit to the wisdome of those Fellowes who expelled him, than to the contrarie coniecture of the reporter? Shall that by-stander be therefore thought euer after *vnworthie of all credit?*

146 Whosoeuer of his faction shall read the late Catholike *Apologie* (as it is intituled) *out of Protestant writers*, hee will wish *P. R.* had beene a newly professed *Pythagorean*, to whom a fiue yeeres silence had beene inioined: for Protestant Authours are there cited, as confessing (but how truly we are not heere to dispute) that some Fathers 400. yeeres after Christ haue held some Romish positions: notwithstanding the same Protestant Authours doe condemne those positions as vtterly superstitious. In which allegations the Apologists are contented to receiue from Protestants a confession of so much antiquitie of some Romish Doctrine; and yet oftentimes doe not acknowledge or regard the iudgement of the cited Authors in condemning such opinions. Will now *P. R.* permit vs to answer these *Apologists* after his example, saying, *ô impudent impietie, and malicious falshood!* Will you cite Protestants for confessing such Doctrines as ancient, which they condemne to haue beene superstitious? I would wish *P. R.*

to

to call his fiue wits into one Senate, and after due deliberation to ſhape me an anſwer. I feare he will be driuen to a *non plus*: For either muſt he teach vs to confute their *Apologiſts*, and to note them to haue beene fraudulent diſputers; or elſe confeſſe himſelfe to haue plaid the part of an idle, impudent, and an intolerable accuſer.

III. *The vnfortunateneſſe of this his declamatorie calumniation.*

147 *P. R.* will not haue his Reader to count otherwiſe of this Pope *Gregorie*, alias *Hildebrand*, than of a man commendable, *not only for uertue, but alſo for ſanctitie*: as if he had ſaid, not only for a good man, but alſo for a godly: wherein it may be that *P. R.* hath beene not only not acute, but alſo abſurd: For as eaſily may godlineſſe be ſeparated from goodneſſe, as ſanctitie from any perfect vertue. But to the matter. As it is written, *Oportet hereſes eſſe, there muſt be hereſies*, ſo is it implied that there muſt be contradictions, but to this end, that the truth may be victorious; which I hope will be verified in this preſent example of Pope *Gregorie*, who may be vnto vs (if wee beleeue the Romiſh hiſtorians) a mirrour of all impietie.

Firſt, *Cardinall Benno* liuing in his time, ſet foorth his life, and writeth that [y] *He entred into the Popedome by force: that he ſuborned a man to murther the Emperour, when he was at diuine ſeruice: that hee caſt the Euchariſt into the fire: that hee was a Necromancer; and a contemner of religion.* [y] Benno hiſt. de vita Greg.

Secondly, *the Abbat Vrſpergenſis* writeth, [z] *That he was an vſurper of the ſea of Rome, not appointed by God, but intruded by fraud and money; a diſturber of the Empire; a ſubuerter of the Church.* [z] Vrſperg. an. 1080.

Thirdly, *Sigebertus Gimblacenſis*, a Monke, writeth that [a] *Hildebrand troubled the States of Chriſtendome; raiſed vp the Saxons againſt their liege Prince; diſcharged ſubiects from their oth of fidelitie; and cauſed* Rodulph *the Duke of Burgundie to proclaime himſelfe Emperour*. After reporting from a writing found after his death in exile thus; *We giue you to wit who haue the care of ſoules, that Pope* Hildebrand, *alias* Gregorie, *being* [a] Sigeb. An. 1074. & anno 1085.

at the point of death, called vnto him one of the Cardinals, whom he did specially affect, confessing to him that he had greatly offended God and his Church in the abuse of his pastorall charge, and by the perswasion of the Diuell raised hatred and wrath against mankinde. If three witnesses be not sufficient against a Pope, of whom one is a *Monke*, an other an *Abbat*, the third a *Cardinall*, let vs further vnderstand that

Fourthly, *Seuerinus Binius* in his new editions of the Councels, [b] confesseth that the Bishops in a Councell *At* Woormes, *Anno* 1076. *declared that Gregorie was to bee deposed:* And that *The Councell at* Papia *Anno* 1076. *did excommunicate him:* And that *The Councell of Bishops at* Brixia *did depose him: the Acts of which Councell, as they are recited by Vrspergensis, shew these causes;* [c] *Because he was an vsurper of the Sea, &c.* And *The Councell at* Mentz *Anno* 1085. *declared him to bee iustly deposed.* Thus we see that *P. R.* by denying one Councell of Bishops of *Italie* in *Papia* to haue opposed themselues against this *Gregorie*, hath, contrarie to his desire, gained with that one of *Papia* three other Councels, one of *Brixia*, another of *Woormes*, the last of *Mentz*. So vnluckie hath hee beene (to vse his owne Simile) in a lost game to *see the last man borne*. I must yeeld him therefore the priuilege of a loser, which is to fret, and rage, and raile, and to call mee malicious. The matter were lesse hainous in him to haue beene onely slanderous against man, if he were not also, in a sort, blasphemous against the Gospell of Christ.

[b] Binius conc. tom. 3. pag. 1281. and pag. 1191. Although he call them not *Concilia* but *Conciliabula*.

[c] See a little before out of the testimony of *Vrsper.* lit. z.

IIII. *His blasphemie.*

148 *If any man* (saith he) *would discredit both Christ and Christian Religion, and say our Euangelists did recount foule things against him (as heere this Minister saith our Historiographer doth of Pope Gregorie) and namely that he was accused of the Scribes and Phariseis for casting out Diuels by the power of Belzebub, for deceiuing the people, for mooning sedition, &c. and the like crimes, which our Euangelists doe recount indeed, but doe condemne them also as false and calumnious: were not this as good a maner of reasoning as this of* Tho. Mortons *out of* Lambertus

against

against Pope Hildebrand, *who is by them so highly commended, as you haue heard, and his aduersaries condemned?* Thus *P. R. Thomas Morton* will tell you that your *maner of reasoning* is not so good. For suppose that *T. M.* in his reasoning had beene guiltie of some errour, yet this your comparison cannot be free from blasphemie; the consequence whereof is this: It is like impietie in *T. M.* in citing the witnesse of *Lambert*, concerning the opposition of the Bishops of *Italie*, which *Lambert* condemned; and to giue more credit vnto them condemning the Pope, than vnto *Lambert* condemning those Bishops: As it is for a man reading the Gospell, where it is recorded that the Scribes and Pharisеis opposed themselues against Christ, to beleeue rather those Scribes and Pharisеis, condemning Christ, than to giue credit vnto the Euangelists, condemning the Pharisеis. Whosoeuer shall exactly examine the Analogie of this comparison, must needs acknowledge it to be in a maner blasphemous. For either must Christ the sonne of God be compared with Pope *Gregorie*, a sinfull man, and (as some iudge) the man of sinne, as though it were a like impudencie to say that *Gregorie*, a sinner, might no more iustly be condemned of the *Italian Bishops*, than Christ, who was righteousnesse it selfe, of the *Scribes* and *Pharisеis*, which in the schoole of Christianitie must necessarily be iudged a blasphemie. Or else the likenesse consisteth in the comparison of the reporters, matching the holy *Euangelists* and their *Monks Frisingensis* and *Lambertus* together, to thinke it no lesse impietie not to beleeue rather these two *Monks* condemning the *Italian Bishops* (who they say were aduersaries to the Pope) than those Bishops, though condemned by the *Monks*; then it is not to beleeue rather the Euangelists condemning the *Scribes* and *Pharisеis* (who were enemies vnto Christ) than the same *Scribes* and *Pharisеis*, though condemned by the Euangelists. But to compare in like beleefe the holy Euangelists who were *Calami Spiritus sancti* (as *S. Hierome* calleth them) that is, *The pens of the holy Ghost*, and could not erre, and the reports of superstitious *Monks*, who, almost, could not but erre, is an inference altogether impious.

146 But if *P. R.* (as I hope hee will) wish his consequent to be rather prooued ridiculous than so sacrilegious, then let him vnderstand the dissimilitude and vnlikenesse of his comparison. For first the iudgement of those Historiographers, *Frisingensis* and *Lambertus*, two Monks, in condemning those *Italian Bishops* is different from the iudgment of *Sigebert* a Monke, of *Urspergensis* an Abbat, of *Benno* a Cardinall: but the Euangelicall Historiographers doe all of them fully consent together; therefore hee not acknowledging the Euangelists condemnation of the Scribes and Pharisies, and that *Lambertus* his condemnation of the Italian Bishops, are nothing alike.

Secondly the Pharisies were of different profession vnto the Euangelists, the Italian Bishops were of the same religion with the obiected Historians: therefore to credit the Pharisies against the Euangelists, and to credit Bishops against Monks, cannot bee proportionable. But why doe I trouble my selfe with these my Aduersaries madling conceits? I hasten, for conclusion to

A challenge against P.R. *the* Mitigator.

§ 19.

150 THe challenge which *P. R.* hath made is peremptory; vz. [d] *The Replie of* T.M. *is full of words, without substance: of flouriſh, without truth: of fraud without reall dealing.* But what if this vaunt be but the wind of a swolne bladder, the fancy of an idle braine, the Rhetoricke of a voluble and lauish tongue, whereby *T. M.* is calumniously traduced? what amends will *P. R.* make? [e] *If I proone not* (saith *P. R.*) *that* T.M. *hath dealt fraudulently against his conscience, by multiplicity of examples, let me be thought to haue done him iniury.* This is an excellent and Priestly discharge, he will exact of his iniurious Aduersaries, I doubt not, a satisfaction reall; or if not that, yet a verball confession: or at least the contritiō of the hart. But you see what amends I may expect from his fatherhood, viz. when he hath iniuried me, he will be content to be thought *to haue done me an iniury*; heereby affoording me only the comfort

[d] Treat. of *Mitig.* 1. cap. 3. num. 4. pag. 92.

[e] Treat. *Mitigá.* cap. 3. num. 3. pag. 92.

fort to thinke, that being iniuried, I may bee thought to be iniuried. This man when he hath offended, is like to proouue a deuout penitent, who is lame of his hands, not yeelding any reall satisfaction; dumbe in speech, not making any confession; yea and euen, in a manner, dead also without all sense of sinne by contrition, not so much as thinking vpon the fault himselfe, will only be content by others to bee *thought to haue done an iniurie.* By this profession *P. R.* may defraud a whole College by false accounts, and discharge himselfe, saying; My Masters, be it known vnto you, I may be lawfully thought to haue deceiued you. Is this a Catholike *Mitigation?*

151 As for the integrity of my conscience, I doe auow, that if I haue not in the iealousie of mine infirmity done that, which no one (to my knowledge) hath done this many ages, to wit, reuiewed some of mine owne books, and examined them, not as an Author, but as a censurer, discouering such my escapes, as I could at any time find, and publishing them in print with open *Animaduersions*, to the end that mine owne correction might be my Readers direction:

If I haue not earnestly desired, and, by the law of Loue, challenged of my friends strict iustice, in noting such depraua-tions, as might any where occur, and (lest they should suspect their reprehensions to become lesse acceptable vnto mee) if I haue not professed it to bee my greatest offence, not to bee in that maner offended: If I haue beene euer so peruersly obsti-nate, as not willing to be reformed by any Aduersary:

Againe, although I cannot but chuse to be strucke rather of a friend who woundeth, that he may heale, than of an enemy who intendeth only to hurt; a friendly *animaduersion* being as *an antidote*, which is a reprehending of me, lest that I might be reprehensible: & the taxation of an enemy being as a *toxicum* calumniously poisoning whatsoeuer deserued good: yet, if I haue euer beene so wickedly peruerse, as not, (whensoeuer iustly) to be willingly reprooued by any Aduersary, turning, as ve-nome into treacle, his deformation into reformation:

If in my ordinary course of life any can charge mee with a bent to this vice of falsifying, although it were for hope of

whatsoeuer

whatsoeuer aduantage: Then (not to adde, If it be not almost impossible for any man citing foure or fiue hundred testimonies, as factors in their accounts, by chance to erre in some particulars, without note of fraud or cosenage) then, I say, I will confesse my selfe worthy of all the criminations of *frauds, trickes, deceits, cosenages*, and whatsoeuer opprobrious imputations *P. R.* either hath or can fasten vpon me.

152 Concerning the disposition of my Aduersary. If hee bee not manifested to haue so behaued himselfe in termes so despightfully malignant, as if the capitall letters of his name *P. R.* did iustly betoken *Princeps Rabularum*:

If not so doatingly vaine in ostentation of his owne wit and learning, as if *P. R.* did truely signifie *Phormio Romanista*;

If not in defense of his cause, in both the questions of *Rebellion* and *Æquiuocation*, so dissolute, as if *P. R.* might bee worthily interpreted *Praeuaricator Reus*:

If not in his criminations & obiections of falsifications so vnconscionably and impudently vniust, as if *P. R.* might certainly deserue the interpretation of *Perfidie Reus*; as partly in this *Preamble*, and more in the *Incounter* may be obserued: Then will I assume all his odious attributes as proper vnto my selfe;

153 Lastly, for the cause. If I doe not auouch the *discouery of Romish positions and practises of Rebellion* to bee iust:

If I proue not the *Treatise of Mitig.* to be like an Apothecaries box of poison, with the outward inscription of *Antidote*:

If I manifest not his precious and glozing reasons for defense of their *Mentall æquiuocation*, to bee no better than the apples of *Sodome*, which vanish into ashes at the first touch:

If, lastly, I shew not that the chiefest aduantage of Romish Aduersaries, doth consist in falsifications; all which this *Preamble* hath but touched, and the *Incounter* (God willing) must handle: Then let my Treatises be purged with fire, and my selfe challenged to a recantation. But these things being, by Gods grace, directly performed, the fruit therof wil be (Christian Reader) to establish thee both in truth of speech, and dutifull allegeance, and to put my Aduersary *P. R.* (I hope) vnto silence, I pray God, to repentance.

Gloria Deo.

DAVNGEROVS PO-
SITIONS AND PROCEE-
dings, publiſhed and practiſed within this Iland of Brytaine, *vnder pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbiteriall Diſcipline.*

Δεινὰ τὰ τῆς τυραννίδος ῥήματα.

My ſonne feare the Lord and the King: and meddle not with them that are ſeditious. Prou. 24. 21.
They deſpiſe gouernement, and ſpeake euill of them that are in authority. Iude.

BIBL. CANT. ACAD.

LONDON
Imprinted by Iohn VVolfe.
1593.